

BIBL. NAZIONALE  
CENTRALE-FIRENZE

1374

20





12/5  
0-5  
40

B7H 20

# OUTLINE

OF A

## GRAMMAR OF THE ZEND LANGUAGE.

BY

MARTIN HAUG, DR. PHIL.,

Superintendent of Sanscrit Studies in the Poona College, Honorary Member of the  
Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, etc.

BOMBAY:

PRINTED AT THE BOMBAY GAZETTE PRESS.

1862.



---

OUTLINE OF A GRAMMAR  
OF THE  
Z E N D L A N G U A G E.

---



# OUTLINE

OF A

## GRAMMAR OF THE ZEND LANGUAGE.

---

### I—THE IRANIAN LANGUAGES.

The languages of Persia, commonly called Iranian, form a separate family of the great Arian stock of languages, which comprises, besides the Iranian idioms, the Sanskrit (with its daughters), Greek, Latin, Teutonic (with English), Slavonian, Letto-Lithuanian and Celtic dialects. The Iranian idioms themselves are to be brought under two heads :

1. Iranian languages in the strictest sense.
2. Affiliated tongues.

The first division comprises the ancient, middle age, and modern languages of Iran, *i. e.* of Persia, Media, and Bactria, or chiefly of those countries which are styled in the Zend-Avesta, the "Arian countries" (*airyáo danhávé*). We may class them as follows :—

(a.) The East-Iranian or Bactrian branch, extant only in the two dialects, in which the scanty fragments of the Parsee scripture are written ; the more ancient of them may be called the "Gâtha dialect," because the largest and most important pieces preserved in this peculiar idiom, are the so called Gâthas or songs; the younger, in which most of the books, which now make up the Zend-Avesta, are written, may be called "ancient Bactrian" or

the "classical Zend language," which was for many centuries the spoken and written language of Bactria. The chief differences of the two dialects will be pointed out in the grammatical sketch to be given in this chapter, and the question as to their relationship to each other, will be briefly discussed at the end. The Bactrian languages seem to have been dying out in the third century B. C., no daughters of them having been left.

(b.) The West-Iranian languages or those of Media and Persia. They are known to us during the three periods, antiquity, middle ages, and modern times, but only in one dialect, viz., that which at every period served as the written language throughout the Iranian provinces of the Persian Empire. There are several dialects mentioned by lexicographers, but we know but very little of them.\* Of the ANCIENT PERSIAN a few documents are now extant in the cuneiform inscriptions of the Kings of the Achæmenian dynasty, to be found in the ruins of Persepolis, on the rock of Behistun, near Hamadan, and some other places of Persia. This language stands nearest to the two Bactrian dialects of the Zend-Avesta, but shows, however, some peculiarities; for instance, instead of *z* we find *d* used, e. g. *adām* *I*, in Zend *azem*; *dasta* hand, Zend *zaçta*. It is undoubtedly the mother of the modern Persian. The differences between both are nevertheless great, and to read and interpret the cuneiform inscriptions written in the ancient Persian, Sanskrit and Zend, although they be only sisters, have proved to

\* In Sayid Hossein Shâh Hakikat's Persian grammar, entitled *Tochfat ul a'jam*, there are seven Iranian languages enumerated, which are classed under two heads, viz., (a) obsolete or dead, and (b) such tongues as are used. Of the ancient he knows 4: *Soghdhi* (the language of the ancient Sogdians, *çughdha* in the Zend-Avesta); *Zduli* (instead of *Zâhli*, the dialect of Zabulistan); *Sikâi* (spoken in Sejestan, called *Sakas-tens* by the Greeks); and *Hirwi* (*Harôyu* in the Zend-Avesta, the modern Herat). As languages in use, he mentions *Parsee*, which, he says, was spoken in Istakhar (Persepolis), the ancient capital of Persia; then *Deri* or Court language, according to this author, spoken at Balkh, Bokhara, Merw and in Badakshan; and *Pehlevi* or *Pehlerdâni*, the language of the so called *Pehlev*, comprising the districts of Rai (*Ragha* in the Zend-Avesta), Ispahan and Dinnr. *Deri* he calls the language of Firdausi, but the trifling deviations he alleges to prove the difference of *Deri* from *Parsee* (for instance they say in *Deri* *ashkâm* belly for *shakâm*, and *abd* instead of *bâ* with), refer only to slight changes in spelling, and are utterly insufficient to induce a philologist to make *Deri* an idiom different from *Parsee*.



be more useful than its daughter, the modern Persian. The chief reason is the loss of nearly all the grammatical inflexions in nouns, verbs, genders, &c., in the modern Persian, while in the Persian, as written and spoken at the time of the Achæmenids (500—300 B. C.), we find still a great many inflexions agreeing with those of the Sanskrit, Zend, and of the other ancient Arian tongues. At what time the Persian lost almost all its terminations, and came into the condition of its present grammatical poverty, which makes it appear rather like the Chinese than the Arian sister tongues (whose grammar is so highly developed), we cannot ascertain. But there is every reason to suppose, that this dissolution and absorption of the terminations on account of their having become for the greater part utterly unintelligible, began before the Christian era, because in the later inscriptions of the Achæmenids (400 B. C.), we find already the grammatical forms confounded, which confusion we discover in many portions of the Zend-Avesta also. No inscription of the successors of the Achæmenids, the Arsacids, in the vernacular Persian being extant, we cannot trace the successive dissolution of the ancient Iranian. Among the Persian inscriptions still extant, those which stand, as to their time, next to those of the Achæmenids, belong to the Sassanids, who ascended the throne of Iran in A. D. 235. From them, although very rare, except on coins, we may learn that the general grammatical structure of Persian, at the Sassanian times, as regards the want of grammatical terminations, was almost in the same state as we find it now. But besides the loss of the terminations, another considerable change is to be observed, viz. the intermixture of a foreign (Semitic) language. The coins of the Sassanids (from A. D. 235—640) show many Semitic words, but with Arian terminations. To make that clear, I shall give the reader a short specimen of this style.

In the inscription of King Shapur I. (who reigned from A. D. 238 to 269), found at HAJIĀBĀD, copied by Westergaard, and added to his edition of the Bundelshesh (without any explanation), we find the following titles:—

*Mazdayasn bagi Shahpuhri malkán malká Irán v Anirán minó*

*chatrî min yazdân barj mazdayasn bagi Artashatr malkân malkâ Irân minô chatrî min yazdân nafi bagi Babagân malkâ, i. e., the Ormuzd worshipper, the ruler Shapur, the emperor of Irân and Not-Irân (Turan), of divine origin through God, the son of the Ormuzd-worshipper, the ruler Ardeshir, emperor of Irân, of divine origin through God, -grandson of the ruler Babagan, the king.*

*Mazdayasn* is in the old language *Masdayaçna*, the terminating *a* being lost; *bagi* is the ancient *baga* (literally, god) applied to kings, like the Grecian *theos*, god,\* and the Sanscrit *deva*; the final *i* is the so called *Idhâfat*, or the relative particle which joins one noun to the other or an adjective to the substantive, which use is extremely frequent in the modern Persian. *Shahpuhr-i*, the proper name of the king; in ancient Persian it would sound *Khshathra puthra*. The final *i* is of the same nature as that in *bagi*; it connects the name of the King with his titles. *Malkân Malkâ* corresponds to the ancient Persian *khshayathiya khshayathiyânâ*, King of Kings, and the modern Persian *Shahanshâh*; it is of Semitic (Chaldee) origin (compare *malkâ*, the king, in Chaldee, and *malkô* in Syriac), but with the Iranian plural termination *ân*, which was originally used for the genitive plural only, but afterwards applied to all cases of the plural indiscriminately. *Irân* and *Anîrân* are in the ancient language *Airyana* and *Anairyana*; *v* (*u*) is a corruption of *uta*, and *minô chitra* would be *mainyu-chitra*, having a heavenly origin; *min* is a Semitic particle meaning "from" instead of ancient Persian *hacha* and modern Persian *az*; *yazdân*, mod. Pers. *yazdân*, god, which corresponds to the ancient *yazatônâm*, the genitive plural of *yazata*, i. e. a being deserving worship.† *Barj* is the Chaldee *bar*, son (*ben* in Hebrew and Arabic); the *j* at the end is another pronunciation of the relative *i* above mentioned. *Naf-i*, is the Zend *napâ*, S. *naplâ*, Lat. *nepos*

\* One might take this terminating *i* as an adjectival termination, but on the coins we often find the simple *bag*.

† The plural is here used as a term of respect; compare the Hebrew *elohtn*, a plural, and the Aethiopic *amltk*, a plural too, but both applied to god.

grandson (preserved, but with a somewhat changed meaning in *nephew*).

Besides coins and a few inscriptions, books also are extant from the Sassanian times. It is hard, and in many instances impossible, to ascertain the accurate date when they were written; thus much is only certain, that they exhibit that form of the Persian tongue which was current in Persia during the Sassanian rule (235—640 A. D.), and for the period immediately subsequent to its overthrow. This Pehlevi literature, as far as it is preserved, is of a merely religious character, being closely connected with the restoration of the Zoroastrian religion by the Sassanids. The most important remnant of it is a translation of the chief parts of the Zend-Avesta (*Yasna*, *Visparad* and *Vendidâd*), and some minor pieces. Other religious books, without a Zend original, are extant, such as the *Bundehesh*, *Shikandgumâni*, *Dinkart*, *Atash Bahram*, etc., and by searching in the libraries of ancient priestly families, one might discover several Pehlevi books, utterly unknown hitherto.

As to the nature of the Pehlevi language to be found in all these books, and the relationship in which it stands to that on the coins and inscriptions, I shall quote here some of my remarks made about this subject in my German pamphlet "On the Pehlevi language and the Bundehesh" (Göttingen 1854).

The Pehlevi of the books differs from that to be met with on coins and inscriptions, but these differences are not so great as to justify the supposition, maintained by Westergaard, that both are utterly distinct languages, the former a pure Iranian, the latter a Semitic idiom. The main character of both is the same, viz. a mixture of Semitic and Iranian elements, the Semitic part being always identical with Chaldee forms and words, and the Iranian with Persian. The difference consists only in the larger or smaller intermixture of either. The inscriptions at Hajiâbâd, mentioned above, exhibit one and the same text in two very nearly related, yet not identical idioms. The first, marked (A) at the end of Westergaard's *Bundehesh*, the commencement of which inscription we have explained above, shows the same idiom

which we find on the coins ; it is full of Semitic words, but the structure is Iranian, not Semitic ; thus we have for instance the Persian plural termination in *ân*, the Persian way of expressing the genitive case by means of the suffix *i* (to be traced to the relative pronoun *yât*). In the other idiom marked (B), the Semitic element prevails even in the structure ; it thus stands nearer to the Semitic than to the Iranian character, though it is nowhere to be recognised as a really Semitic language. We find in it, for instance, the Chaldee plural in *în*, e. g. *malkîn*, kings, and instead of the Iranian *bag*, divine, the Semitic *aldhd*, divine. In comparing these two idioms with the Pehlevi of the books, we find some differences, but they are not of any great importance. On the contrary, we meet many of those strange looking forms and words, which made Pehlevi appear in the eyes of several scholars as a fabricated language, on the inscriptions (where certainly no fabricated language could be made use of by the kings) as well as in the books, e. g. the particles, *aik* which, what, *amat* when, *val*, (*var* in the books, *l* there being often not distinguished from *r*), *apan*, *avan* to, towards, *panij* before, etc., all being of Semitic origin. The non-irânian element is called *Huzvâresh* by the Parsee priests. If they read Pehlevi, they generally read the corresponding Persian instead of these foreign words,\* being, however, ready, if called

\* They read, for instance, *kaâ* which, instead of *aik* ; *kâstân* to wish, want, instead of *bunahunastân* ; *nâhistân* to get, instead of *jatibuntân*, etc. This circumstance has very likely given rise to Westergaard's strange opinion, that the foreign words of the Pehlevi books are mere ideographic signs, invented to conceal the meaning of the sacred books from laymen. But the priests, if asked, whether or not the foreign word, styled by Westergaard an ideograph, has a peculiar pronunciation, answer in the affirmative, and pronounce then the signs, character by character, saying at the same time "that is *Huzvâresh*." This name, therefore, is to be confined to the Semitic element in the Pehlevi only, and not applied to the Pehlevi language in general. To facilitate the reading of these Semitic words, styled *Huzvâresh* (this is in all probability the right pronunciation and not *Huzvâresh*), we find often an Iranian termination added to a Semitic word, e. g. *abi-dar* father, *ami-dar*, mother, where *dar* at the end indicates that *abi* and *ami* is to be pronounced as *pâdar*, *mâdar*, the Persian substitutes for the Semitic *ab* father, *am* mother ; *yahavvunand* (read by the priests *janoonand*) they are, where *yahavvun* is the 3rd person plural of the second tense (its meaning being that of the present and future) of the Chaldaic verb *havâ* to be, and the termination of the 3rd plural, present tense, of the Persian *hastân*, they are.

upon, to pronounce them according to the characters in which they are written; but their pronunciation of these Semitic words, whose roots and forms are unintelligible to them, is in many cases evidently wrong. The chief reason of this is the great ambiguity of the Pehlevi writing, where not only the short vowels are omitted (as is usual in all Semitic alphabets, except the Aethiopic), but one and the same character is capable of three or four different meanings; so, for instance, *o*, *u*, *v*, *n* are expressed by one character, for initial *j*, *h*, *s* there is one sign indiscriminately used, etc. The correct form and pronunciation is to be ascertained from the Chaldee only, a good knowledge of which tongue is indispensable in order to understand Pehlevi.

Now the question arises, do these three idioms of the Pehlevi language, which we can discover, represent dialects of three different districts in Iran, or do they belong to different periods, or are they mere products of peculiarities existing in different styles? The two idioms, found in the Hâjiabad inscriptions, which are written in two distinct kinds of characters, one of which (B) resembles very much the Hebrew writing, exhibit certainly two dialects of one and the same language, as spoken in two neighbouring provinces. The book Pehlevi (called *Zend-Pehlevi*, i. e. Pehlevi of the commentary) differs from the Pehlevi on the coins only as far as the style is concerned; it was very likely that kind of language, which was used in the schools by scholars only, and not by the people. At the time when Pehlevi ceased to be a living language, and the restoration of the pure Iranian words was begun, the scholars, not daring to change the writings, descended from the Sassanian times, accustomed themselves to substitute in reading the Persian equivalents for the foreign Huzooresh words. This circumstance gave at length rise to a new form of writing commentaries on religious subjects, consisting in the use of the more distinct and clear Zend characters, where each sign has but one phonetical value, and in exterminating all the foreign Huzooresh words, to be replaced by pure Persian ones. This new form was called *Pâzend*, serving, as is the case up to the present day, to facilitate the reading and understanding of the ancient

Pehlevi books only. Thus Pâzend has two meanings like Zend, it means explanation of the Zend commentary, this explanation being written in the pure Iranian, it is applied also to the language used for that purpose.

The Iranian part of the Pehlevi differing but little from modern Persian, we dare say, that the Persian language, as written 1600 years ago, was, in grammatical respects, almost in the same state as we find it at present. It needed only the Chaldee words to be exterminated and pure Iranian ones re-established throughout in their room, in order to arrive at that state of the modern Persian which is presented to us in the *Shâhnâmeh* by FIRDAUSI. Soon after the conversion of the Persians to the Mohammedan faith, a great many Arabic words were incorporated with the Persian tongue, forming now an inseparable part of the language, such as the Norman words in modern English. That mixture of Persian with Chaldee was called *Pehlevi* (the Semitic part went by the name *Huzooreh*, the purified Persian by that of *Parsee* or Pâzend). As to the time, the period of *Pehlevi*, extends from A. D. 200 (if not earlier) to 700; that of *Parsee* from 700 to 1100; and that of *modern Persian*, the language of *Jâmi*, *Nizâmi*, and *Hâfiz*, from 1100 up to the present. The only changes in the Persian for 1600 years have been in the words; many words used in the *Parsee* books and *Firdausi* are now obsolete, and unintelligible to an unlearned Persian. Although there are translations of many parts of the grand *Shâhnâmah*, yet up to the present day *Firdausi's* language is not yet properly investigated into, the explanation of many things in the poem requiring more than an ordinarily good oriental scholarship.

The second chief division of the Iranian tongues comprises the *affiliated languages*, that is to say such as share in the chief peculiarities of this family, but differ from it in many essential points. To this division we must refer the *Ossetic*, spoken by some small tribes in the Caucasus, but completely differing from the other so called Caucasian languages; also the *Armenian* and the *Afghanic* (*Pushtoo*).

## 2—THE ZEND LANGUAGE.

The general character of the Zend language in both its dialects is that of a highly developed idiom. It is rich in inflexions, in the verbs and in the nouns. In the former, where three numbers and eight cases can be distinguished, it agrees almost completely with the Vedic Sanskrit, and in the latter, it exhibits a greater variety of forms, than the classical Sanskrit. Besides, we find a multitude of compound words of various kinds, and the sentences are joined together in an easy way which is apt to contribute largely towards a quick understanding of the general sense of passages. It is a genuine sister of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Gothic; but we find her no longer in the prime of life; she is presented to us rather in her declining age. The forms are not always kept strictly distinct from each other, as is the case in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin; but are now and then confounded, much less, however, in the verbs than in the nouns, where the dissolution first began; the crude form, *i. e.* the original uninflected state of the word, is often used instead of the originally inflected forms. So, for instance, we find *daéva* (the Indian gods) which is the very crude form, employed as the instrumental singular, which ought to be *daévēna*, or at least *daévdá*, and as nominative plural, which ought to be *daévānōhō*, or at least *daévdá*. The long vowels of the feminine in the nominative, *ā* and *ī*, are out of course, so that from the termination alone the gender is not so easily to be recognised as in Sanskrit; so we have *daéna*, creed, belief, instead of *daéndá*; moreover the forms of the dative and instrumental, chiefly in the plural, are often confounded. These deviations from the original forms, and the confusion of terminations are by far more frequent in the classical Zend, than in the Gâtha dialect, where the grammar in most cases is quite correct.

The chief reason of the grammatical defects of the present texts of the Zend-Avesta lies, I think, in the want of grammatical studies among the ancient Persians and Bactrians. Had the study of grammar, as a separate science, flourished among the ancient Mobeds and Dustoors, as was the case with Sanskrit among the ancient Brahmans, and had Iran produced men like

Pânini, Kâtyâyana, and Patanjali, who became the lawgivers of the classical Sanskrit language, we should have less ground to complain of the bad condition of the texts, and found less difficulties in explaining them, than we have now to encounter. There is every reason to believe, that the grammar of the Bactrian language was never fixed in any way by rules; thus the corruptions and abbreviations of forms, which gradually crept from the popular and colloquial into the written language, became unavoidable. In Sanskrit the grammarians built, by means of the numerous rules, under which every regular or irregular form of that language was brought, a strong bulwark against the importation of forms from the popular and vulgar language, which was marked by them as *Prâkrit*. Grammar became a separate branch of study; manuscripts were then either copied out or written in the strictest accordance with rules of grammar, but always with respect to phonetical peculiarities, especially in Vedic books, if they had any real foundation. To these grammatical studies of the Brahmans, which belong to an age gone by long ago, we chiefly owe the wonderfully correct and accurate grammatical state of the texts of the Vedas and other revered books of antiquity. In Iran almost all knowledge of the exact meaning of the terminations died out at the same time that the ancient Iranian languages underwent the change from inflected to uninflected ones. Books were extant and learnt by heart for religious purposes, as is still done by the Parsee priests. But when the language of the Zoroastrian books had become dead, there were no means for the priests, who cared more for a merely mechanical recital of the sacred texts, than for a real insight into their meaning, to prevent the corruptions of the texts. Ignorant of any thing like grammar, they copied them out merely mechanically like the monks in Europe in the middle ages, or wrote them down from memory, of course full of blunders and mistakes. For this reason, we find the copies, now in use by Mobeds and Dustoors, in the most deplorable condition as regards grammar; the terminations are often written as separate words, and vowels inserted according to the wrong pronunciation of the writer, where they ought to be omitted.



The best text, comparatively speaking, is to be found in the oldest copies only, while in Vedic manuscripts (if written for religious purposes) there is not the slightest difference, whether they are many centuries old, or executed at the present day. Westergaard has taken great trouble to give a correct text, chiefly according to the oldest manuscripts, which were accessible to him. His edition is in most cases far preferable to the manuscripts of the priests of modern times. The Dustoors, therefore, should consider it their bounden duty to agree on an accurate text according to the oldest manuscripts, which they could procure very easily. In this task they will be aided much by Westergaard's valuable edition, and the grammatical researches of other European scholars. Why will they remain behind the Brahmans and the Jews, who have preserved their sacred writings so well, and facilitated modern researches to so great an extent? The era for a sound philological explanation of the time-hallowed fragments of the ancient Zoroastrian writings has now come, and the Dustoors as the spiritual guides of the Parsee community, should take a chief part in it. The darkness in which a good deal of this creed is enshrouded, must be dispelled. But the only way of attaining such a desirable result is a sound and critical knowledge of the language.

### 3—SOUNDS, VOWELS, AND CONSONANTS.

#### (A) VOWELS.

*a, á, ā; i, í; u, ú; e, é, é (aé); o, ó;—ai, ái; au, ao; áu, áo; eu, éi (aéi); ou, oi, ói; ui, úi.\**

For so many vowels (12 simple, and many diphthongs) separate characters, or combinations thereof, are used in the Zend manu-

\* The long vowels are marked by the circumflex. The vowels to be pronounced in the continental manner; *ā* is a long *a* with a slight tinge of a nasal sound to be pronounced like *ā* in the French *âme* soul; *ái* is equal to *é*.

scripts; which fact shows clearly, that in ancient times each of them had its own pronunciation, but at present the priests pronounce several of them, such as *a* and *e*, and *o* and *u*, without any distinction. Therefore the original pronunciation of them can be only guessed by us rather than really ascertained.

Of the vowels given in the above list, I shall point out only such ones as are peculiar to Zend. Whilst the short and long *a*, *i*, *u*, *e*, *o*, &c., are easily understood by any one, *ā*, always occurring before *m* or *n*, is a long *ā*, with a slight tinge of a nasal sound; it is chiefly used in the genitive plural termination *anām*, *ām*=S. *dnām*.—Of the *e* sounds, *e* and *ē* are to be noticed. Whilst the Sanskrit has only one *e*, which is always long, having originated from a fusion of *a* and *i*, the Zend has a short *e* besides, which has either no correspondent in Sanskrit, or which corresponds to the short *a*. This *e* is often in Zend a mere vehicle for facilitating the pronunciation. Quite peculiar is *ē*, which is a long vowel, and prevalent chiefly in the Gâtha dialect, where it often replaces the final *ó* of the usual Zend; for instance, *kē*, who?=*kó*; *yē*, who,=*yó*; *vachē*, word,=*vachó* &c. The writers confound it often with *ī*, which circumstance seems to hint at its close affinity to that sound.

The frequent use of *a* before *ē* and *ó* is very likely not a peculiarity of pronunciation, but of writing. The Zend texts are handed down to us not in their original characters, but in a later form\* of writing, which arose very likely, shortly after the commencement of the Christian era, when Syriac literature began to spread in Persia. For the Zend characters are written from right to left, like all the Semitic alphabets (except the Himyaritic in South Arabia and the Aethiopic); while the Sanskrit, and the ancient Bactrian alphabets, such as are to be found on coins, and in the cuneiform inscriptions exhibiting the ancient Persian tongue, are written from left to right. The form of the Zend characters besides, bears a great resemblance to some Syriac alphabets. Now to revert to *aē* and *ao*

\* As the Old Testament has been preserved in the Chaldee characters though originally written in the Samaritan.

at the beginning of words, it is a peculiarity of the Semitic languages to introduce every initial vowel by prefixing an *Elif* (a soft aspirato sound, generally rendered by *a*, but not exactly corresponding to it). This peculiarity has crept into the writings of the Zend texts, so that a word hardly ever commences with *é* but with *ae*. In the middle of words, *ae* may be a peculiar diphthong; for instance, in *viçpaéshām* (genitive plural of *viçpa* all), etc.

In the Gâtha dialect, we observe this peculiarity that if words terminate in vowels, they terminate always in long, never in short ones. This lengthening of the vowels at the end extends even to the shortest of all, the short *e*, which, according to its origin, is not even to be considered as a full vowel (it is similar to the *shvá* in the Hebrew). So we find *râzarē* instead of *râzare*, rule, way, (Yas. 32, 12). The reason of this peculiar circumstance lies certainly not in the nature of the Gâtha dialect, but in the liturgical application of the pieces written therein. They are, as we shall see afterwards, the most important and holiest prayers used in the Zoroastrian divine service, and were originally sung (see p. 4. 8). The way of singing them was very likely analogous to that in which the Brahmans, the nearest relations of the Parsees, used to sing the verses of the *Sâmaveda* at the time of solemn sacrifices only, and which is preserved up to this day on such occasions. From hearing a *Sâmaveda* priest sing some verses of this Veda, one can ascertain, that he lengthens the terminating vowels of a word, even if they are short. In Sanskrit, where the grammar was fixed by rules, the texts were not changed according to the modo of singing them, while in Zend, where nothing regarding the grammar and pronunciation was settled, these peculiarities produced by singing the Gâthas and some other pieces, crept into the manuscripts, which were often written from memory only, as is now often the case.

On the changes of one vowel into another, I shall make but few remarks. There are in Zend two vowels, *i* and *u*, and one semivowel *y*, which change an original *a* preceding or following, into *ai*, *é* or *ô*, a circumstance, which we observe in the Teutonic

languages also.\* So instead of *barati*, he bears, we find *baraiti* (*ai* instead of *a*, influenced by the terminating *i*), *yézi* or *yéidhi*, “if,” instead of *yadi*, as it is in Sanskrit, *verezyéiti*, instead of *verezyati*, he works. Now and then the *y* which has produced the change of *a* into *é*, disappears, e. g. *naçé* (Vend. 8, 21) imper. flee! perish! instead of *naçya* which is the regular form. In the Gâtha language we perceive, besides this change of *a* into *ai* or *é*, that of *a* into *ô*, for instance, *verezyôlû*, instead of *verezyatû*, he may work; *vatôyôlû* for *vatayatu*, he may tell, announce (Yas. 35, 6).

---

### (B) CONSONANTS.

GUTTURALS.—*k, kh, q, g, gh, h.*

PALATALS.—*ch, j.*

DENTALS.—*t, th, d, dh.*

LABIALS.—*p, f, b.*

SEMIVOWELS.—*y, r, v, w.*

SIBILANTS.—*ç, sh, s, z, zh.*

NASALS.—*m, n, ñ, ñ, ñ.*

I shall now make some remarks on the sounds which are peculiar to the Zend language. Of all gutturals *q* (corresponding to the Latin *qu*) is one of this sort; in modern Persian, *kho* corresponds with it, e. g. *khvâb*, sleep, in Zend *qafua* (S. *svapna*, Latin *somnus*, Greek *hupnos*). In the Gâtha dialect this sound is more frequent than in the usual Zend, e. g. *qyem*, I may be, instead of *hyãm*, Lat. *sim*; *çpeñtaqyâ* (gen. sing. of *çpeñta*, holy) instead of *çpeñtahé*.

The palatal sounds, *ch* and *j*, as well as the soft sibilants, *z* and *zh*, which are in many respects near to the palatals, are always changed into a harsh guttural sound *kh*, before *t*, *th* (confounded now and then with *dh*, e. g. *ukhthem*, “what is spoken, a word, instead of *ukhthem*), and *s*: e. g. *berekhdha* “high, elevated,”

\* Compare staff, pl. staves, *a* being pronounced in the plural like *é* of the continental languages.

instead of *berezta* ; *aokhta*, he spoke, instead of *avachta*, from *vach* to speak, *vákḥ-s* nom. sg. speech, acc. sg. *váchem* ; *drukḥ-s* nom. sing., *drujem*, acc. sg., the palatal reappearing always immediately before vowels.

Among the dental class, *th* is of a peculiar nature, and not to be identified with *th* of the Sanskrit, which is simply an aspirate *t* ; it is rather near to the English *th*. In most cases it is only a change of the simple *t* on account of its being followed by *r*, *w*, and sometimes *y* ; e. g. *thri* S. *tri*, three, *thwá* S. *tvá*, thee ; *ithyéjô* ruin (from the S. root *tyaj* to leave). A very instructive example occurs in *átar-s*, fire ; the gen. sg. is *áthró*, the acc. *átarem*, *t* being changed into *th* before *r*, and retained before the vowel. Now and then it corresponds with S. *th* ; e. g. *atha*, then, after, S. *atha*. If a word terminates in *t*, we find generally a separate sign used for it ; but it appears to be rather a calligraphic peculiarity than to imply a separate dental sound ; for that reason I left distinguishing this final *t* (in certain words as *tbaésh* S. *dvish* to hate, *tkaésha* religion S. *dikshá*, it is used at the beginning also instead of the common *t*). *Dh*, the soft aspirate of the dental class, is not more strictly distinguished from the simple *d*, which fact causes now and then a confusion, rendering it, for instance, difficult to distinguish *dá*, to give, from *dhd*, to make, create.

Of the labial class *f* is not to be identified with S. *bh* ; it is an aspiration of *p*, as *th* is of *t*, on account of its being followed by *r*, or *s* and *sh* ; e. g. *fra* S. *pra*, Greek and Latin *pro*, for ; *áfs*, water, (nom. sg. of *ap* water) ; *kerefs*, body, Lat. *corpus* (nom. sing. of *kerefs*) ; *fshu*, rich, monied. Among the semi-vowels we miss *l*, which in the ancient language seems not to have existed at all ; in the Pehlevi and modern Persian we find it, but it is always traceable to an original *r*. In Sanskrit *l* is later than *r*, but it is already known to the Vedic dialect.

In sibilants, the Zend is peculiarly rich, even richer than Sanskrit. The *ç* (to be pronounced as *ss* like the French *ç*) is uniformly put for *t*, if another *t* follows ; in Sanskrit one says *villa* having possessed (from the root *vid* to possess, get), but in

Zend it is always changed into *viçta*,\* (compare in Greek *oistha* = Zend *vôçta*, thou knowest, from *oida* = S. *veda* I know). In the Gâtha dialect we find it often at the end of words instead of *t*, e. g. *çtavap* instead of *çtavat*, praising. *Z* and *zh* are two soft sibilants, lacking the Sanskrit. Into these soft sounds the dental *d* is changed, if it meets another *d*, e. g. *dazdi*, give, instead of *dad-dhi*. In the Gâtha language, we sometimes find the peculiarity of changing *çt* into *zd* or *zhd*, when a soft sound, *b* or *g*, is in the following syllable, e. g. *azdêbis*, the instr. plur. of *açti*, existence, body (afterwards from ignorance used as a nominative), *vazhdreng* acc. pl. of *vaçtra*, field.

Of the nasal sounds *n* is used before *h*, e. g. *anhus* life, and inserted between *a* and *u* in certain forms, e. g. *merechanuha*, kill; *ñ* is used before *h* and appears to be stronger, like *ng*. They have, however, nothing to do with the etymology, and are a mere produce of pronunciation; *ñ*, generally used before the dentals, seems to be a half nasal sound, like the Sanskrit Anusvâra.

#### 4—ROOTS.

The last elements of an aggregate of sounds, which remain, after all the suffixes and terminations have been taken off, are denoted by the name of "root." For instance, to find out the root of *verezyéiti* "he works," first the termination of the 3rd pers. sg. present tense *ti*, and then *yéi* (*ya*), being the characteristic of the present tense and those words, that are derived from it, are to be taken off; the remaining part *verez* then is the root, to which the idea of "working" is attached. Most nouns being traceable to verbs, we shall confine ourselves to the enumeration of some verbal roots. Original roots are of course monosyllabic, consisting now and then of a single vowel only, or being a com-

\* It is the first part of the name *Vitâçpa* the original form of the Grecian *Hystaspes* meaning "possessing horses."

bination of a vowel with a simple or double consonant, or of two consonants with a vowel between them, e. g. *i* to go (in *aiiti* he goes S. *eti*, Latin *it*, he goes); *dá* S. *dá* to give; *vá* to blow (*váoñti*, they blow, *váta* wind; *gá* to go (in *gata*, gone); *çru* to hear; *mere* to die; *kere* to make; *mar* to speak, recite, (*framaráité*, he announces); *char* to walk; *tach* to flow; *vakhsh* to grow; *vach* to speak; *mrú* to say (in *mraot*, he told); *bar* to bring; *as* to be (in *ahmi* I am, *donhat* he was); *bú* to exist &c. From the simple roots others were derived by means of some additional sounds, which, of course, can change the meaning; so *dath* to place, is a derivation of *dhá*, *dá* to make, *mereñch* to kill, one of *mere* to die. Now and then we find a verbal root joined to a noun, in order to modify the meaning, e. g. *yaozhdá*, *yaozh-dath* to purify, make clean. As to their practical use, the reader will soon become aware, that the roots are mere fictions of philology, abstract grammatical notions, but in order to obtain a thorough knowledge of a language, they are nevertheless very useful. They show the common origin of words, which, in the course of time have become different both in forms and sense. So *naçus* a corpse, (*nekys* in the Greek) and *naçaité*, *nashaité* he perishes, goes away, are of the same root: *naç*, S. *naç* to perish; *drukhs*, destruction, lie, *oiwidruzhaiti*, he believes, *aiwi-drukhtó*, a liar, are traceable to *druzsh* S. *druk* to destroy; *frathwereçem*, I created and *thwóresta* creator, are derivations of *thwereç* *thwoareç*, *thwóres* (only different pronunciation of the same root)=S. *tvaksh* to fabricate, make, create (literally "to cut"); *açti* existence, *ahmi* I am and *açtváo* existing, come likewise from the root *as* to be.

---

## 5—CRUDE FORMS.

From the root, in which the notions of verbs and nouns are likewise contained, both are then distinguished by means of suffixes, or if they are left, at least by the terminations or inflexions. These new forms, produced in order to distinguish verbal and

nominal notions, are called the crude forms ; to these then the inflexions only need being added to make the word complete. I shall illustrate this by some examples. To form from the root *naç* to perish, a noun meaning " what has perished," a dead body, the suffix *u* is required ; *naçu*, therefore, is the nominal crude form to which then the terminations may be added, as *naçu-s* nom. sg. *naçúm*, acc. sg. &c. Sometimes the inflexion is added without the previous formation of a proper crude form, e. g. *drukh-s*, lie, from the root *druxh* (the soft *xh* is changed into the harsh *kh* on account of *s* being a harsh sound, see pag 55).

To make up the verbal crude forms, different modifications of the root, which produce a slight change of meaning, must take place. In order to impart, for instance, to the crude form of *çru*, to hear, the causal idea " to make hear, recite," it must be changed into *çrávay*, or to the root *mereñch*, to kill, the desiderative idea " to wish to kill," it must be altered into *mimerekhsh*. Even the tenses often require a crude form, to which the terminations may be added. In order to form the present tense " he hears," or " he does" from the respective roots *çru* to hear and *kere* (*kar*) to make, the syllable *nu* (used also in Sanskrit and Greek, in certain verbs which conveys the meaning " now,") is to be added. Thus the crude forms of the present tense, *çurunu* (euphonically instead of *çrunu*) and *kerenu* are obtained, to which the termination of the third pers. sg. *ti* is to be joined. In this way, the word *çurunaoiti* (modern Persian *shunad*) " he hears" and *kerenaoiti*,\* (modern Persian *kunad*) " he makes," are then formed; the literal meaning of both is hear-now-he, and do-now-he.

## 6—MODIFICATIONS OF THE VERBAL ROOTS.

There are three chief modifications of the verbal roots, irres-

\* The original *u* of *nu* is changed into *o* before *ti*, in strict accordance with the rules of Sanskrit grammar, where in certain classes of verbs in the singular of the present tenses active voice, the change of *u* into *o*, and of *i* into *e*, always takes place. This change is called *Guna* in Sanskrit grammar.



pective of tense or mood, to be observed viz. Causal, Desiderative, and Intensive forms.

1. CAUSAL FORMS, expressing the idea "to make, to get made," are very frequent in the Zend-Avesta. They are formed exactly in the same manner as in Sanskrit, by lengthening the vowel of the root and adding the syllable *aya*. Examples: *kārayēiti* S. *kāragati*, he gets made (from the root *kere*, *kar*, to make); *tāpayēiti*, he makes hot (from the root *lap*, to be hot, to burn, Latin *tepere*); *jāmayēiti* (Yt. 17, 21), he makes go out, expels (from the root *jam* to go); *vi-shāvayat* (Vend. 2, 11), he made go asunder, (from *shu* to run, to go); *grāvayēiti* he makes hear, recites (from *cru* to hear); *ava-çtayat*, he fixed, established, Vend. 2, 34. (from *çtā* to stand); *khraoçyēiti* (an abbreviation of *khraoçayēiti*), he makes cry, i. o. scares, frightens Vend. 15, 5. (from *khruç* to cry, Persian *khurushidan*); *dārayēhi*,\* thou keepest (from *dar*, *dere*, to hold, modern Persian *dāshtan*).

Closely connected with the proper causal verbs, are the so called DENOMINATIVES, that is to say, verbs which are formed from nouns. Examples: *raēthwayēiti*, he pollutes, literally: touches with *raēthwem*, a fluid (now and then it means the fluid of light); *vyākhmanyēiti*, Yt. 8, 15, he takes into consideration, derived from *vyākhman* consideration; *pereçanyēiti*, "he puts the question," from *pereçana*, questioning. There is another way of forming DENOMINATIVES besides the causal suffix *aya*; that is the verbal root *dā* to make, added to a noun. Examples: *pad-dayēiti* Vend. 15, 5, he treads (the dog) with the foot, literally: he makes, applies his foot (*pad*, Latin *pes* foot); *yavō-dayāt*, it might grow corn (lit. make corn); *çudhus-dayāt*, it might be thrashed (lit. make thrashing); *pistrō-dayāt*, it might be ground (lit. make grinding); *guñdō-dayāt*, flour might be made (lit. it might make flour) Vend. 3, 32.

2. DESIDERATIVE forms, expressing the wish of obtaining any

\* Yas. 11, 8: *yō mēm aiwis-hutem dārayēhi* who keepest me, (Homa) without having squeezed my juice. *aiwis-hutem* consists of *hutem*, the past participle of *hu*, to squeeze, to prepare the Homa juice, and the negative *a* joined to *vis*, liquid, juice; *v* is changed into *w* on account of a having become *ai* in consequence of the *i* in *vi*

thing, are made up exactly in the same manner as in Sanskrit, viz. by reduplication of the first syllable and addition of *s* to the crude form before the terminations. Examples: *mimarekshâtê*, Vend. 15, 14. he endeavours to kill (from the root *mereñch* to kill); *çuruçrushmanô*,\* Yt. 14, 21. desirous of hearing (from *çru*, to hear); *zishnáonhemnáo*,† Yt. 13, 49. wishing to know (from *zan* to know, in Sanskrit it sounds *jñāsamānāh*, wishing to know). In the Gâtha dialect, these forms are on an average more frequent, than in the usual Zend, where they are gradually dying out. Examples from the Gâthas: *didereghæhó*, Yas. 44, 15. thou wishest to recite (from *dereñj* to recite prayers), *chikhshnushó*, thou wast desirous of worshipping Yas. 45, 9. (from *khshnu*, to satisfy one, to worship); *mimaghæhó*‡ Yas. 45, 10. thou wast desirous of magnifying (from the root *maæ*, *magh*, to be great).

3. INTENSIVE FORMS serve the purpose of enhancing the strength of the verbal notion to make it more emphatic. The original way of forming them is to repeat the whole root, and then to join the terminations to it, thus put twice. Afterwards, as it is usual in Sanskrit, they lengthened only the vowel of the first part, and left out the consonants, which followed it; for instance, the Sanskrit *dédīpyamāna*, very brightly shining, is an abbreviation of the original, *dīp-dīpyamāna*. In Zend the original intensive forms prevail, while the abbreviations are rare. Examples: *nizhdare-dairyát*, Vend. 18, 38. he would tear out with great force (from *dar* to tear; Pers. *daridān*); *fra-vāæa-vazaiti*, Vend. 3, 31. he furthers, promotes very much (from *vaæ* to carry); *hareke-harechayát*, Vend. 5, 60. he would pour abundantly (from *harech* to emit, pour); *naénizhaiti*, Yt. 8, 43. he uproots (from *nizh*, to sweep away, clean, S. *nij*). In the Gâthas we find chiefly the abbreviated form of the Intensives. Examples: *rāreshyantî*,

\* *Vayæm vāchim çuruçrushmanô*, desirous of hearing the voice of birds.

† It ought to be *zishnáonhemnáo*, the present participle, middle voice, nom. pl.; but the soft *z* is incompatible with *n*, therefore it is changed into the harsher *sh*; *h* in *hemnáo* corresponds with *s* which is after *d* and before *e* generally made *h*.

‡ All these forms in *shó*, *shô* are second persons sg. imperfect tense of the desiderative form.

Yas. 47, 4. they hurt repeatedly or very much (from *rash*, *resh* to hurt); *vóividáité*, Yas. 30, 8. it is possessed, held completely (from *vid* to possess, get); *fravóividé*, Yas. 44, 11. I am well known (from *vid* to know).

## 7.—VOICES IN THE VERB.

There are three voices to be distinguished in Zend, as well as in Sanskrit and Greek: viz., the active, the middle or reflexive, and the passive. The first and third being well known and generally applied in the modern languages, only the second voice requires some remarks. I have called it the middle or reflexive voice; it corresponds with the so called *Ātmanêpadam* in Sanskrit, the middle in Greek, and the deponent in Latin. According to its nature, it occupies the place between the active and passive voices, participating in the nature of both. Originally the middle voice served to express passive as well as reflexive notions, and it was only in the course of time that they established a proper passive form by the addition of *ya* to the root, but without changing the terminations. The original passive meaning of the reflexive voice is, however, now and then, chiefly in the participial forms, preserved. Examples: *hachaité*, Yt. 8, 60; 10, 117; 14, 44. means "he is followed, accompanied, provided (*baéshaṇa* with medicaments), while the corresponding active form *hachaiti*, Yt. 10, 66. means "he follows," requiring an accusative (*yim hachaiti* whom he follows); in the same manner the pres. participle *hachinnó*, conveys merely the passive meaning "followed, provided"; *vaṇennó*, Yt. 14. driven, drawn (by horses in a carriage); *baremnó*, borne (in a Palkee) Vend. 8, 73. In all these examples the passive meaning of the middle is evident, the formal passive voice would require the forms: *vaṇ-yamnó*, *bairyamnó*.

Closely connected with the passive is the reflexive notion, which prevails now in the forms of the middle voice. Thus in the very common middle voice form *yaṇamaidé*, we worship,

the idea "for ourselves, our benefit," is implied. Other examples are : *viçanuha* Yt. 10, 32. (in an address made to the angel *Mithra*) come yourself to my offerings *i. e.* in person ;\* (*his*) *hām-baranuha*, take these things together, receive them for thy own use ! *nī* (*his*) *daçva*, deposit them for thy use (in thy heavenly abode) ! These three forms, just quoted, are imperatives 2nd pers. sg. of the middle voice, and convey evidently a reflexive sense. The active imperative *bara* Yt. 5, 63. means simply "bring," but the corresponding middle form, *baranuha*, means, "bring for yourself" *i. e.* take. *Pereçem, apereçem*, impf. 1st pers. sg. act. means, I asked, put a question ; but the corresponding form of the middle voice *apereçé* Vend. 2, 2. is, I conversed ; the pres. partic. of the middle voice, *pereçmana* Yas. 30, 6. conversing, deliberating.

Often the meaning of this peculiar voice coincides with that of the active. So *mainyēiñtē*, they believe. To express intransitive or neutral notions this voice is of course more fit than the active ; we find it, therefore, often applied for such purposes. Examples : *raodhahé* thou growest (from *rudh* to grow) ; *çatété* Vend. 18, 5. he lies down (from *çi* to lie down) ; *açtété* he sits (from *ds* to sit).

---

## 8.—MOODS.

In the Zend language there are four chief moods, which can be used in all the three voices above mentioned, and are distinguished from each other by different characteristics. These four moods are as follows : INDICATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE, POTENTIAL, and IMPERATIVE.

The INDICATIVE does not require any further remarks. Example : *barāmi* I bring ; *mraomi* I say ; *barat* he brought, &c.

\* The Izd or angel was expected to come himself down from his celestial abode to his devotee, when worshipping him in the proper way.

## 9.—THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

There are two kinds of this mood to be found in the Zend-Avesta, one with long, and the other with short terminations, which both being lost to the classical Sanskrit, are extant in the ancient language of the Vedas also. The characteristic feature of these subjunctive moods is the constant insertion of *á* between the root and the termination, e. g. *van-á-iti*, *van-á-t* from *van* to destroy.

The FIRST SUBJUNCTIVE takes after its characteristic *á* before the terminations of the present tense indicative *mi*, *hi*, *tí* (see below) &c. e. g. *vaéndaíti* Yt. 13, 84. he may look (from *vaén*, to see, Pers. *bin-am*, I see). As to its meaning, we find it applied in various ways, it is commonly to be translated by "might, would or should." It can depend on particles such as *yat*, *yatha* that, in order that, or it can stand without them. Examples: *yaçe-thwá* (*Anáhitām*) *nóit aiwi-drušhádoñti* Yt. 5, 90. that they may not disturb thee (from *drušh* to destroy); *ava hó mairiyáité*, Vend. 7, 37. (and if) he should then die (from the root *mar* to die); *thwām kainínó jaidhyádoñti*, Yt. 5, 87. the girls shall invoke thee (*Anáhitā*); *niçrinaváhi*, Yt. 5, 87. thou shalt, mayest grant; *baváhi* thou shalt be; *ava-jaçái*, instead of *ava-jaçáhi*, Vend. 19, 18. thou shalt go; we find it in general sentences too, e. g. *láo khshapanó yáo jváhi*, Vend. 18, 27. for how many nights thou mightst still be living (from *jiv* to live).

Very frequently this first subjunctive mood serves to express the FUTURE TENSE, the original forms of which are dying out in Zend. The idea of the future, and that of the subjunctive are related to each other, both implying a state of uncertainty; in Latin the forms of both are very near also. Examples: *katha kháo tacháoñti* Yt. 8, 5. how will the wells flow (from the root *tach* to flow)? *viçpa drukhs násháité* Yt. 2, 11. every evil doer will perish, or is to perish (from the root. *násh* to perish, go off); *jaçáiti té avanháécha*, Yt. 1, 9. he will come to thy support (from *jaç* to come); *hó doñháíti*, Yt. 13, 18. he will be (from *as* to be.)

The SECOND SUBJUNCTIVE has after its characteristic *á* only

the shortened terminations of the imperfect, 3rd pers. sg. *át*, 3rd pl. *ān*, &c. This form is chiefly used in the sense of an Imperative, but in the third pers. sg. only, as *ṣtavát*, may he praise, let him praise (from *ṣtu* to praise); *vanát* Yt. 19, 95. may he destroy let him destroy; *janát*, Yt. 3, 14. may he slay, let him slay. It can change places with the first Subjunctive and be used in conditional sentences conveying the sense of "should, would;" examples: *yat kereñtát*, Vend. 7, 37. if he should cut (from the root *kerent*, in the medical sense "to operate"); *viçpem á ahmát yat bavát* (a common phrase), all for the purpose that it should be, might be. Now and then it is applied to the future tense also, e. g. *kadha nó avi uzyardt*, Yt. 8, 5. when will he come to us? (from the root *ar* to go)

#### 10.—POTENTIAL.

Of this mood we find two kinds, which, as to their formation, correspond exactly to the Potential (called *Ling*), and Precative (called *Ling Āçishī*) of the Sanskrit grammar. The chief characteristic of both is the addition of an *i* to the crude form of the present tense. In the first form, the proper Potential, this *i* only is required; but in the second, the Precative, *á* is to be added to it; thus we obtain, as the characteristic of this second form, the syllable *yá* which is to be inserted between the root, or the crude form of the present tense, and the terminations.

The FIRST POTENTIAL is of very frequent use, chiefly in the second and third persons sg. and pl.; it is easily recognised by the terminations *óis* (2nd pers. sg. active voice),—*isa*, *aśsa* (2nd pers. sg. middle voice),—*ōit* (3rd pers. sg. act. voice),—*aśta*,—*íta* (3rd pers. sg. middle voice),—*aéta* (2nd pers. pl. act. voice),—*yadhvoem* (2nd pers. pl. middle voice),—*ayen*, *yen* (3rd pers. pl. act. voice),—*yañta* (3rd pers. pl. middle voice). The first persons are but of rare occurrence; instead of them they use the first pers. imperative. We find, however, the following terminations: *aém* (first pers. sg. act. v.),—*aéma*, (first pers. pl. act. v). e. g.

*jaçaéma*, we may come,—*óimaidhé* (first pers. pl. middle v)., *búidhyóimaidhé*, Ys. 9, 21. we might awaken (from *bndh* to awaken). Now and then we meet a dual form, ending in *uêtem*, *ayatem* (3rd pers. dual act. v).

The application of this first Potential is manifold. In the 2nd pers. it is very frequently used as a polite form of the imperative, when any thing is to be commanded or asked for. Ex. *fra-baróis* thou shalt bring (from *bar* to bring); *hiñchóis* thou shalt sprinkle (from *hiñch* to sprinkle); *dreñjayóis* thou shalt recite (from *dreñj* to recite); *nipáyóis* thou shalt protect (from *pá* to protect); *ꝛbayaésa* thou shalt invoke (from *ꝛbé* to invoke); *fradai-dhisa* Yt. 3, 1. thou shalt keep (from *dhá* to put); *áhisa* Yt. 10, 32. thou shalt sit (from *áh, ás* to sit); *ꝑchiñdayadhwoem* Yt. 1, 28. thou shalt cleave for yourselves (from the root *ꝑchiñd* to cleave, Latin *scindo*); *várayadhwoem* you shall cover (from *var* to cover); *dareꝛayadhwoem* you shall chain (from *dareꝛ* to chain, fetter, bind); *upazóit* one shall strike, beat (from *ꝛan* to strike, slay); *ava-baróit* he may bring hither; *barayen* they shall bring. *chikayen* Vend. 15, 12. they shall atone (from *chi, ki* to atone, be punished; it is instead of *chikayen*); *vád hayaéta* Vend. 4, 44. he may give him in marriage (from *vád* to marry, carry home); *framaraéta* he may teach; *íçaéta* he may have, obtain for himself, (from *íꝑ* to have, possess); *nishidhaéta* he may sit down (from *shadh* to sit); *ámayañta* Vend. 7, 37. they may learn; *hañdareꝛ-ayañta* they shall chain (from the root *dareꝛ* to fasten, make tight).

To express the idea of habitude, the Potential is used as the proper mood e. g. Vend. 4, 47. *yatha maghavó fravákhshóit*, as the Magian priest is in the habit of reciting (from *vach* to speak); Vend. 3, 42. *yatha vátó framareꝛóit* as the wind is in the habit of sweeping away (from *mareꝛ* to sweep); Yas. 12, 6. *Zorathustró daévdís vydmrviót*, Zoroaster was in the habit of speaking against the Daêvas (from *vrít* to speak); *apereꝑayatem* Yas. 12, 6. these two used to converse.

The SECOND POTENTIAL, which we may style the Potential proper, is used as a PRECATIVE or with the negative *má* as a PROHI-

BITIVE and as a CONDITIONAL. The 2nd and 3rd persons prevail in this mood ; in conditional sentences the first person is to be found also. The terminations are : 1st sg. *yām*, 1st pl. *yama* ; 2nd pers. sg. act. voice *yáo*, pl. *yata* ; 3rd pers. sg. act. v. *yát*, pl. *yán*. Of the first and second persons in the middle voice I could discover no distinct traces ; but the 3rd pers. pl. of this voice —*yáres*, is occasionally to be met with.

As to its meaning, it coincides often with the first Potential, but on account of its being a combination of the characteristics of both the Potential and the Subjunctive, it is more emphatical, and solemn than the simple Potential. Its proper place, therefore, is in praying, in imparting blessings, giving an exhortation or a command, or pronouncing curses ; joined to the negative particle *má*, it is the strictest form of prohibiting a thing. Ex.: *surunu-yáo nō Mithra yaçnahé* Yt. 10, 32. mayst thou hear our prayers, Mithra ! ; *vaēibya nō ahubya nipayáo* Yt. 10, 93. mayst thou (Mithra) protect us in the two lives (the bodily and spiritual) ! *barəçna fraçlarennuyáo* Yt. 12, 3. thou shalt spread the Barsom (from the root *çlar*, *çlere* to spread) ; *dayáo* Yt. 10, 94. thou mayst give (from *dā* to give) ; *buyáo* Ys. 62, 2. thou shalt be (from *bū* to be) ; *buyata*, Yt. 13, 147. you may or shall be ; *má buyata* Vend. 18, 17. you must not be, do not be ; *dáyata* Nyây. 3, 11. you may give (from *dā*). Examples of the third person : *jamýát* Yt. 1, 33 ; 10, 5. he shall come (the angel who is invoked) ; *buyān* Yt. 16, 3. they shall be ; *fratereçān*, they shall fly ; *fradvarān* they shall run away, Yt. 11, 6. (from *tereç* to fear, and *dvar* to run). The vowel *ā* is now and then shortened, e. g. *chikayat* Vend. 7, 38. instead of *chikayát*, he may atone. While the 3rd person sg. active voice of this form is rarely applied to express a command, or a wish (for which the 2nd Subjunctive is more usual), the 3rd pers. pl. middle voice, ending in *yáres*, seems to be more common in that sense. Ex.: *daithyáres* Vend. 8, 22. they shall put for themselves (from *dath* to put) ; *buyáres* Nyây. 3, 11. they shall be (from *bū* to be) ; *aiwi-çachyáres* Yt. 8, 56. (if they) should or might perform ; *hyáre* Vend. 17, 9. (these nails) shall be thy lances (from *as* to be).



It is frequently employed in conditional sentences, chiefly in the antecedent clause, introduced by the particle *yéxi* if. Ex. *yéidhi oxem nóit dailhyām* (potential of the perfect tense) Vend. 1, 1. if I would not have created (perfect tense of *dhd*) ; *yéxi nóit uxvarexyát* Vend. 4, 25. if he should not atone for (from *varex* to do, to make ; *ux-varex* to do away with a thing, especially a sin by punishment) ; *akmát hacha irishyát* Vend. 13, 38. and (if) he should be hurt (from *irish* to be hurt, wounded). In the consequent clause of conditional sentences, we find this mood also, see for instance Yt. 8, 11. where the star Tistrya, who brings the rains to mankind from a fabulous sea, says as follows : if men had invoked me with prayers, I had then gone forth (*shushuyām* from *shu* to go ; it is a perfect form), I would have come (*jaghmyām* from *gam* to come, perf. tense).

Now and then this precative and conditional mood is used in a strictly potential sense, expressing the faculty or ability to do a thing. Thus we read Vend. 6, 29. as much (*chvat*) as they can grasp (*hañgēurvayān* : from *gerew* to take) with their hands.

## 11.—IMPERATIVE.

This mood, very frequently used, has various forms, which, although they agree with those of Sanskrit, have preserved some peculiarities. The most peculiar feature in these Imperative formations of the Zend and Sanskrit, is the first pers. used in sg. and pl. active and middle voices, a formation unknown to the other Arian tongues, where its want is supplied by conjunctive forms. We have just become aware of the unfrequent use of the first persons of the subjunctive and potential moods in the Zend. The reason is their having been absorbed, for the greater part, by these peculiar Imperative forms, which are very emphatical, expressing through the length of their forms very palpably the idea of intention and volition or duty : I will, I intend, I am resolved, &c. They are made up as follows :

1st pers. sg. act. voice *á, áni, a* ; middle voice, *ái, áné* ; 1st pers. pl. act. voice *áma*, middle v., *ámaidé*. Ex. *avanayéni* Yt. 19,44. I will carry away (from *ní* to carry) ; *ava-baráni*, I will bring ; *janáni*, I will slay (from *jan* to slay) ; *varedhayéni* Vend 2. I will make grow (or, protect) ; *baráma*, let us bring ; *kva nida-tháma* Vend 6,44. where must we lay down (a dead body) ? We find it often used after relative particles, as *yat, yatha*, e. g. *dandí nó yat baváma* Yt. 5,58. give us that we may be ; *yatha nijanáma* that we shall certainly slay. The middle form in *áné* is quite peculiar to Zend, and wanting in Sanskrit. Ex. *viçáni* Vend. 2. I will go myself (from the root *viç* to go, enter, now and then to be taken in the general sense "to be") ; *fravaráné*, I will profess myself (the Zoroastrian religion ; from *var* to choose).

The plural of the middle voice *ámaidé* is rare ; we find it in the Gâtha dialect only ; see Yas. 58,3. : *nemanhé viçámaidé* let us go for ourselves to prayer ; *nemanhé ávaédayámaidé*, let us devote ourselves to prayer (from *vid*, to know, the causal is *vaéday* ; with the preposition *á* it means "consecrate").

In the Gâthas the forms in *áni* are comparatively rare ; those in *á* and *ái* prevail. The form in *á*, being the ancient termination of the first pers. sing. imperative, is solely confined to these ancient prayers. Ex. : *pereçá* Yas. 44, 1. 2, 3. I will ask ; *yáçá* Yas. 28, 2. I will pray ; *çbayá* Yas. 33, 5. I will worship ; *fravakhshyá* Yas. 45, 1. I will promulgate (from *vach*, to speak, *vakhshya* being here the crude form of the future tense). Before the enclitic *cha* "and" this *á* is shortened to *a* e. g. *vaouchacha* Yas. 45, 3. and I will tell.

Besides this Gâtha form in *á* we find one terminating in *ái* in both dialects, conveying the same sense, e. g. *khshnaoshái* Ys. 46,1. I must worship (from *khshnu* to worship, *khshnaosh* is an Aorist form) ; *mēñghái* Ys. 43,4. I will have thought i. e. my wish was to think (from *man* to think, but in the crude form of the Aorist *mēñg*, *mēnh* S. *mans*), *mēvái* instead of *manyái* Ys. 45,3. I will think ; *çbayái* I will invoke ; *jaçái* I will come, &c. in the usual Zend.

The 2nd pers. imperative active voice sg., terminates either in

*a*, that is to say, in the crude form of the present tense; or, if there be another termination, as *nu*, added, or, if the crude form be identical with the root, in *dī*, *dhi*. Ex. : *bara* bring ! (here it ends in *bara*, which is the crude form of the present tense : *barāmi* I bring); *ava-jaṣa* come, hither (*jaṣāmi* I come); *uṣe-hista*, rise ! (*uṣe-histāmi* I rise); *kerenūidhi*, make ! (*kerenuomi* I make, from *kere* to make); *ṣtūidhi*, praise ! (*ṣtaomi*, I praise, from the root *ṣtu* to praise); *mṛūidhi* speak ! (*mraomi*, I speak, from *mru*; now and then we find *mru* alone, e. g. *fra-mru* recite); *jaidhi* slay ! Ys. 9, 30. (from *jan* to slay); *para-āidhi*, go to ! Vend. 22, 7. (from *i* to go); *dazdi*\* give ! (from *dā*) which is in the Gāthas always *daidi* give !; *gaidi*, go ! (the Gātha form, from *gā* to go). The plural, active voice, terminates always in *ta*, e. g. *ṣtuta* praise ye ! *pāta* protect ye ! (from the root *pā*, to protect); *uṣehistata* rise ye ! (from *ṣtā* to stand, with *uṣ* to rise); *dāta* give ye !

The second pers. sg. middle voice terminates in *ṣva* and *anuḥa* which both correspond to the Sanskrit termination *sva*; e. g. *nī-daṣva* put, place ! Yt. 10, 32. (from *dath* to put); *ṣṇayoṇuḥa* take a bath ! Vend. 18, 19.; *jijishaṇuḥa*, send for, seek ! Vend. 15, 13.; *nizbayaṇuḥa* invoke ! Vend. 19, 13, 14.

To the Gātha dialect the form in *anuḥa* is not known; there the original *shva*, *hva* is found, e. g. *kereshva* make ! Ys. 40.; *gūshahvā* hear, listen ! Ys. 49, 6. (from *gush* to hear). The plural is *dām*, e. g. *gūshōdām* listen ye ! Ys. 45, 1. *thrāzdām* save ye ! Ys. 34, 7. (from *thrāt* to protect, save).

The 3rd pers. imperative are of very frequent use, expressing the idea : let him do this or that ! he may do ! Now and then they are used in the meaning of a future tense, e. g. *janḥeñtu* they are to come, they will come Vend. 2, - 2. (from *jam* to come, *janḥ* is the crude form of an Aorist). The terminations are as follows :—

Sg. act.—*tu*, pl. *ñtu*; sg. middle voice *tām*; pl. *ñtām*. Ex. : *vanhatu* he may put on clothes Vend 3, 19. (from *vanh* S. *vas* to put on clothes); *qaratu* he may eat ! let him eat ! (from *qar* to eat); *ṣraotu* he may hear; *mraotu* he may tell (from *ṣru*, to hear

\* *Dazdi* in the Gāthas is the 3rd pers. sg. active voice, see Ys. 46, 8; 51, 6.

and *nru* to tell); *açtu* he may be; let him be! *ayañtu* they may go, let them go (from *i* to go); *áfrineñtu* they may praise (from *frí* to love, be kind); *heñtu* they may be! (from *as* to be). The forms of the middle occur in the Gâthâ dialect only,\* as *nidyátām* Ys. 48,7. let him (*Aëshemó*, one of the bad spirits) be put down! (from *dá* to put, with *ní* to put down);† *khshēñtām*, instead of *khshayañtām*, Ys. 48,5. they may have or possess (from *khshi* to have, possess). Besides we once find in the Gâthas Ys. 48,5. the 3rd pers. dual, middle voice, *verexyátām*, in the phrase *garóí† verexyátām tām*, two cows (a team) may till her (*Armaiti*, the soil).

In an old formula preserved in Vend 8,38. we find an imperative form terminating in *tāt*, which agrees entirely with the ancient Vedic forms in *tāt*.§ This formula is *nizhbereta nōit ainizhbereta nizhberetāt*,|| let them bring out every thing to be brought out, which was not yet brought out!

## 12.—TENSES.

In the Zend language we find as many tenses as in the Sanskrit, although less than in the Greek, which is, as to tenses, the richest language of the Arian stock. We can distinguish one formation for the present, four for the past, and two for the future, which differ, as regards their crude forms, and partially in respect to their terminations.

\* *Jaçēñtām* Yt. 1, 25. is very likely such a form too, and to be translated, "they may, or shall come."

† Here the form is, properly speaking, passive, but that does not matter anything as to terminations; the passive and middle voice terminations in the present tense, imperative active, are one and the same.

‡ See Aitareya Brāhmaṇa II, 6. (pag. 30 of my edition) *vapām utkhidatāt*, they may tear out the peritonæum!

§ *Garóí* is a dual like *zaçtē*, the two hands, *óí* being only another orthography of *í*.

|| *Nizhbereta* is the past participle of the root *berē*, *bar* to bring, but in the meaning of a verbal adjective (as is frequently the case in the Greek) expressed in English by the termination "able;" *ainizhbereta* is the 3rd pers. sing. impert. middle voice with the augment *a* (a sign of the past). The relative pronoun is omitted.

The terminations are chiefly of two kinds, longer and shorter ones. The chief difference of the latter class from the former is the absence of the terminating vowel or consonant, or, under circumstances, of a whole syllable, which form part of the former kind, e. g. *mi* (1st sg. act. v.) becomes *m*; *añi* is made *ān*, *en*, &c.

The longer forms are used in the present tense, the first subjunctive and the first future tenses, the shorter in the two potentials, the second subjunctive, the imperfect, aorist, and pluperfect, and to a certain extent, with some modifications, in the perfect tense. The imperative has its peculiar terminations, as we have seen. I shall give here the terminations of both the present tense and the imperfect.

PRESENT TENSE.			IMPERFECT.	
Active voice		Middle	Act.	Middle
Sg. 1	<i>mi</i>	<i>é</i>	Sg. 1	<i>m</i> <i>é</i> <sup>1</sup>
„ 2	<i>hi</i>	<i>hé</i>	„ 2	<i>s, ó</i> <i>e, he</i> <sup>2</sup>
„ 3	<i>ti</i>	<i>té</i>	„ 3	<i>t</i> <i>ta</i>
Dual 1	<i>vahi</i>		Dual 1	<i>áva</i> <sup>3</sup> none
„ 2	not more extant		„ 2	none none
„ 3	<i>tó, thó</i> <sup>6</sup>	<i>óithé</i> <sup>4</sup>	„ 3	<i>tem</i> <i>óithé</i> <sup>4</sup>
Plural 1	<i>mahi, maidé</i>		Plural 1	<i>ma</i> <i>madi</i>
„ 2	<i>tha, dúm G., dhwem</i>			( <i>maidé</i> <sup>5</sup> )
„ 3	<i>ñti</i>	<i>ñté</i>	„ 2	<i>ta</i> <i>dhwem</i>
			„ 3	<i>en, ān</i> <i>añta</i>

<sup>1</sup> *Aguzé* Yt. 17,58. I concealed myself (from the root *guz* S. *guh* to hide).

<sup>2</sup> *Aperece* or *aperecé* Vend 2,1. thou hadst a conversation; it is very likely a contraction of *aperece* (*he*).

<sup>3</sup> *Baváva* Vend 5,25. "as far as we two were above the earth" (*ácha pairicha* literally: up to and towards the earth).

<sup>4</sup> *ipóithé* Vend 8,10. you two keep; *ap-zoyóithé* Ya. 9,10. they two were born (imperf).

<sup>5</sup> *Páirimaídi* Ya. 35,3. we chose, believed, *mainimaídi* we thought.

<sup>6</sup> *Yúidhyathó* Yt. 8,22. they two fight.

### 13.—CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CRUDE FORMS OF THE PRESENT TENSE.

The crude form, out of which the proper present tense is formed, extends not only to the Indicative, Subjunctive, and Potential moods, of which in most cases no other tense is extant, but to the Imperative and the Imperfect (the first past tense) also. According to the nature of this crude form, the verbs are brought in Sanskrit under ten heads, all of which are to be found in the Zend too. I shall enumerate here the different crude forms of the present tense according to the order introduced by the Sanskrit grammarians.

Class I inserts *a* between the root and termination, and changes *i* or *u* of the root into their respective gunas *é* and *ó* (see page 59 note.) Ex. *vaꣳ-d-mi*\* I carry; *bar-ai-ti* he brings; *baodh-ai-té* Yt. 17,6. he awakens; *bañd-d-mi* I bind, tie; *gerex-ai-ti*, he cries, weeps; *fratereꣳ-ai-ti* he flees away.

Class II adds the termination immediately to the root; the vowel of the root, if *i* or *u*, is respectively made *é* and *ó* before the terminations of the sg. active voice (the 2nd person is now and then excepted), and in some persons of the Imperative, 3rd sing. act. and 2nd pl. act. Ex: *ꣳtaomi*, I praise, *ꣳtaoiti*, he praises; *ꣳtavān*, they praised (from *ꣳtu* to praise); *nipá-hi* thou protectest, *nipáiti*, he protects (from *pá* to protect); *mráo-mi* I speak, *mráo*s thou spokest, *mrvañti* they speak (from *mrú* to speak); *aéiti* he goes (from *i* to go); *jaiñti*, he slays (from *jan*), *ghneñté* Yt. 10, 133. they are slain (from *jan*); *jvaiñti* Vend. 2, 41. they live (from *jiv* to live).

Class III reduplicates the root; the terminations are then added immediately. Ex. *dadhāmi* I put, *dadhahi* thou putst, *dadhaiti* he puts; *dadhemahi* we put, *daꣳta*† you put, *dadañti* they put (from the root *dá*, *dhá* to put, confounded with *dá* to give, both being entirely identical in their conjugation); *xazáiti* he pro-

\* The inserted *a* is made *á* before the terminations of the first persons of all three numbers; in the other persons it is short.

† A contraction of *dadatha*; *dazda* in the most sacred prayer *yathá ahé vairya* is a Gátha form of the 2nd pers. plur. act. of the root *dá*.

duces, generates (from *zan* to produce), *zizananti* Yt. 13, 15. they produce (the intensive of the same root); *zaozaomí* Ys. 43, 0. (Sanskrit *jihomí*) I invoke, from the root *zu*.

Class IV adds the syllable *ya* to the root. Ex. *verexyéiti* instead of *verex-ya-ti*, he works, tills the soil (from *verex*), *mainyéĩnté* they believe (from *man* to think, to believe).

Class V marks the present by the addition of *nu* to the root; the same change of the vowel of the root takes place as in the 2nd class. Ex. *kerenaoiti* he makes (from *kere*); *surunaoiti* he hears, *haonaoiti* Yt. 2, 11.\* he hears, (only dialectically differing from the first); *hunaoiti*, he prepares the Homa (from *hu*); *frapinaoiti* he pours out, propagates (from *pi*); *ashnaoiti* he hits, reaches (from *ash*).

Class VI is identical with the first, save the change of the vowel of the root, *i* or *u*, into *é* or *ó*. Ex. *tugén*, they coughed (*luç*), *qíçen* they whined (*qíç*).

Class VII incorporates the syllable *na*, which marks the present tense, to the root itself, as in the Sanskrit; see, for instance, *runadhmi* I hinder, from *rudh*, *na* being inserted between *r* and *dh*. Of this class I know only one example in the Zend, viz. *chiuahmi*, Ys. 12, 1. *chinaçti* Ys. 19., being to be traced to the root *chith*, *chiç* to perceive, get aware; the first form means: I ascribe, I acknowledge; the second: he ascribes, attributes (as a consequence of his having perceived).

Class VIII is almost identical with the 5th; it adds only *u* to the root, instead of *nu*, but the roots end mostly in *n*. Ex.: *fraçtanvanti* Yt. 10, 20. they are stretching themselves (from the root *tan* to stretch).

Class IX adds *ná* to the root. Ex. *gerewnáiti* he seizes, *gerewnāu* they seized (from the root *gerew*, to seize, take).

Class X adds *aya* to the root, and is the proper causal and denominative form (see page 60). Ex. *nipayēmi* I protect (from *pá* to protect).

\* This small piece, being an old spell, shows several peculiarities, which belong very likely to the popular *r*, and not to the written language.

# 14.—PARADIGMS OF THE PRESENT TENSES OF SOME VERY COMMON VERBS.

(*bú*, to exist, *mrá* to speak; *aç* to be; *verex* to work; *kere*, *kar*, to make, &c.)

Active voice.		Middle voice.	
1st Sing. <i>bará-mi</i> , I bring.		1st Sing. <i>buyé</i> .	
„ <i>mráo-mi</i> , I speak.		„ <i>mruyé</i> , I speak myself.	
„ <i>ah-mi</i> , I am.		„ <i>içé</i> ,* I have, or possess. (Ys. 50, 1).	
„ <i>verexyá-mi</i> , I work (Yt. 15, 44).		„ <i>ázby-a</i> , I invoke. (Ys. 15, 1).	
„ <i>kerenuo-mi</i> , I make.		„ <i>tanav-a</i> , I cast (him) down. (Ys. 19, 7).	
2nd Sing. <i>hista-hi</i> , thou standest.		2nd Sing. <i>raodha-hé</i> , thou growest.	
„ <i>bará-hi</i> (subjunct.)			
„ <i>ahi</i> , thou art.			
„ <i>verexyé-hi</i> , thou workest.			
„ <i>kerenú-ishi</i> , thou makest.			
„ <i>kuna-hi</i> , thou art getting with child. Vend. 18, 30.			
Gâtha forms. {	„ <i>dói-shi</i> , thou seest.		
	„ <i>vashi</i> (instead of <i>vap-shi</i> ), thou wilt.		
	„ <i>haf-shi</i> , thou holdest. Ys. 43, 4.		
3rd Sing. <i>bava-iti</i> , he exists		<i>baraité</i> , he brings	
„ <i>aç-ti</i> , he is.		<i>mruté</i> , he speaks.	
„ <i>verexyé-iti</i> , he works.		<i>mainyéé</i> , he thinks.	
„ <i>kerenao-iti</i> , he makes		<i>verenvaité</i> , he teaches.	
„ <i>mráo-iti</i> , he says.		Ys. 31, 17.	

\* t is very likely the middle voice form of *aç* "to be," a having been changed in to é, on account of the heavier terminations of the middle voice.



Gâtha forms.	{	1st Pl. <i>barâ-mahi</i> we bring. „ <i>mahi</i> , we are. Ys. 35, 2. „ <i>urezîyâ-mahi</i> , we work. Ys. 35, 7. „ <i>nemagyâ-mahi</i> , we bring praise. „ <i>uç-mahi</i> , we wish.	1st Pl. <i>barâ-maidhé</i> . „ (3) <i>içâ-maidé</i> , we pos- sess, have. Ys. 35, 7. „ (2) <i>mrû-maidé</i> . „ <i>dade-maidé</i> G. form. „ <i>vare-maidé</i> , we choose.
		2nd Pl. <i>çta</i> , you are. „ <i>isha-tha</i> , you come. „ <i>çasha-tha</i> , you per- form. <i>taurvaya-ta</i> , you defeat. Ys. 13, 38.	2nd Pl. <i>thwarôzh-dûm</i> , you cut, prepare. Ys. 29, 1. „ <i>fravôiz-dûm</i> , you teach, instruct. Ys. 33, 8.
		3rd Pl. <i>bavai-ñti</i> , they exist. „ <i>heñti</i> , they are. „ <i>verexi-ñti</i> , (instead of <i>verexîçîñti</i> ), they work, do. Vend. 15, 5. „ <i>kerenavañti</i> , they make. „ <i>jvâi-ñti</i> , they live.	3rd Pl. <i>mainyêiñté</i> , they believe. „ <i>verenv-aiñté</i> , they cover. Vend 18, 32. „ <i>fradkenté</i> , they thrive. „ <i>vîçêñté</i> , they come, appear. „ <i>pereçêñté</i> , they con- verse.
		1st Dual <i>uç-vahi</i> , we two wish. Ys. 46, 16. 3rd „ <i>jaga-tô</i> , they two come. „ <i>çtô</i> , they two are.	3rd Pl. <i>iç-ôithé</i> , they two keep.

## 15.—PAST TENSES.

## IMPERFECT, PERFECT, FIRST AND SECOND AORISTS.

The past tenses of the Zend are as various as those of its ancient sister tongues. We can distinguish three ways of forming them,

viz.: (a) augmentation, (b) reduplication, (c) composition with the past tense of the auxiliary verb, *aç*, to be.

(A.) Augmentation consists in prefixing a short *a*, either to the verbal root, or to the crude form of the present tense; in both cases, the terminations which are to be added, are shortened. This augment early became unintelligible, and was often left out; hence it does not regularly appear in the Zend. Both forms are in fact imperfects, and to be found in the Sanskrit and Greek also, where the grammarians made a distinction. The Greeks called the first formation SECOND AORIST (indefinite tense), the second IMPERFECT. As to the meaning of both formations almost no difference is to be discovered; the shorter form, which is to be regarded as the older, was, on account of its being too indistinct, in most cases superseded by the longer, the proper imperfect.

We find more frequent use made of the shortest (second Aorist) form in the more ancient Gâtha dialect, than in the usual Zend, where it is very rare; the augment there is always left out. Ex. 1st sg. *dãn\** Ys. 48, 7. I gave, entrusted; 2nd sg. *dáo* Ys. 43, 1. thou gavest; 3rd sg. *dát* Ys. 31, 18. he gave (the same form is to be found in the Yashts 9, 26.); *ni-dáma* Ys. 45, 8. we put down; *dáta* Ys. 29, 10. you gave; *dã, dãn* Ys. 45, 5. 47, 1. they gave; *dáité*, Ys. 31, 11. middle v., he gives himself; *pát* Ys. 32, 13. he protected (from *pá* to protect); *gát* Ys. 46, 6. he went (from *gá* to go).

Of augmented imperfect forms I shall quote here only a few instances; the other imperfect forms will be found afterwards: *açí údúm* 2nd pers. pl. middle v. Ys. 32, 3. you were heard of (from *çrú* to hear); *açperezata* Ys. 31, 16. 3rd pers. sg. middle v., he aspired after (from the root *çperez*); *aokhta*, 3rd pers. sg. middle v., he spoke; *açpereçat* = *pereçat*, he asked; *advareñta* Vend. 19, 45. they ran; *adáunta*, they spoke (from *dvar*, to run, and *dav*, to speak, both terms ap-

\* To both *d* is prefixed. It appears doubtful to me, whether this *d* is the preposition *ort* he lengthening of the augment *a*.

plied to the doings of evil spirits only) ; *apereçē*, I conversed, Vend. 2,2. In the Gâthas the augment is now and then used without any reference to the past time. So Yas. 30,2. *avaēnata* which conveys evidently the sense of an imperative : look ye ! and Ys. 44,14. *anásē*, I may or shall drive away (from *nds*).

(B.) Reduplication is the repetition of the whole root, if very short, or, if longer, of one consonant with a vowel at least. The vowel of the reduplicated syllable ought to be short, but we find it often long ; the consonant differs sometimes from that of the root also. If the consonants of the root be a guttural : *k, g*, then, in the reduplication, we find always the corresponding palatal : *ch, j* ; if it be a sibilant, generally *h* is used. The meaning attached to this reduplication is that of completing an action or state, expressing what is done and over, *i. e.* the past time. It forms, therefore, in the ancient Arian languages, such as Sanskrit, Zend, Latin, Greek, Gothic, &c., the real past tense, generally called, PERFECT ; e. g. *dādareça*, I have seen, S. *dadarça*, Greek *dedorka* (from *dareç* to see), wholly distinct from the imperfect *dareçem*, I saw. The terminations of the Perfect differ from those of the present tense as well as from the Imperfect, yet they stand nearer to the latter. The terminations, as far as we can ascertain them from the scanty texts, are as follows :

Active v. sg. 1st and 3rd—*a*.

„ „ „ 2nd *tha*.

„ „ „ pl. 1st *ma* ; 2nd *tha* ; 3rd *us*.\*

Dual. 3rd *ātare*.†

Middle sg. 1st and 3rd *ē*, 2nd *sa*.

„ „ dual 3rd *aitē*.‡

„ pl. 3rd *are, ere*.

To this reduplicated form, however, the terminations of the Imperfect, with or without the augment, can be added ; then we

\* Yas. 50,10 *aēurus* they have gone (from the root *ere, ir* to go).

† Yas. 13,4. *vaochātarē* they two have spoken, *ēdvarezdātarē*, they two have wrought.

‡ Yas. 13,4. *mamanditē* they two have thought. These three dual forms belong to the Gâthâ dialect only.

obtain the pure PLUPERFECT, e. g. *ava-jaghnat*, Yt. 13,105. he had slain (from the root *jan*, a modification of *ghan*, to slay).

(C.) Composition of the verbal root with the past tense of *aç*, to be, makes a new tense altogether; it is according to its nature the most general past tense. The Greek grammarians call it the FIRST AORIST; in the Sanskrit grammar it is one of the many *Lug* forms; in Latin it is mixed up with the reduplicated past tenses, being no more a separate past tense; for instance, the reduplicated *tutudi* I have thrust, is the perfect of *tundo*, and *scrip-si*, I have written, that of *scribo*, I write. These forms are, however, in the usual Zend very scarce; in the Gâtha dialect which, being more ancient, shows a greater richness in forms, we find them now and then employed. The original *s* is sometimes changed into *h* or *g*. Ex. *çtáonhat*, 3rd pers. sg. act., he placed (from *çtá* to stand); *māçta* 3rd pers. sing middle Vend. 2, 31. he thought; *mēnihá* (*cha*) Ys. 13,5. 2nd pers sg. middle v., thou thoughtst; *mēnihi* 1st pers. sg. middle v. Yas. 43, 5. I thought; which three forms are traceable to the same root, *man*, to think, used in the Zend, as well as in the Sanscrit, exclusively in the middle voice. The literal meaning of these forms is: thinking was he, wast thou, was I, (*māçta*=*man* and *açta* or *çta* middle of v. *aç* to be); other forms of this kind, which are found in the Gâtha dialect, are: *dáonhó* Ys. 34,1. 44,18. 2nd pers. sg. subjunct, middle v., that thou mightst give; the meaning of the past is not adhered to; in the corresponding *dáonhé*, 2nd pers. sg. middle v. Ys. 36,1. "thou putst," we find it kept; the root in both cases is *dá*; *çēnghús* 3rd pers. pl. Ys. 34, 7. they indicated, pointed out (from *çanah*, *çah* to say, promulgate; *h* of the root is changed into *g* on account of the *h* of the termination, two *h* never being allowed to meet). Now and then we find these forms used without any reference to the past; so Ys. 11, 18. *rāhi* 1st pers. sg. middle (from *rá*, to give), means, "I give, present" you, and not "I gave."

## 16.—THE IMPERFECT.

Of all past tenses, the imperfect, which is most frequently used, is chiefly employed in describing past events, or state of things. I shall give here a list of these forms selected from the texts.

1st pers. sing. act. *dadhām*, I created (from *dhā*) ; *vidhāraēm*, Ys. 13, 2. I held, kept (from *dhar* to hold, keep).

1st pers. sg. middle *aguzē*, I concealed myself (from *guz*) ; *apereçē*, I conversed (from *pereç*).

2nd pers. sg. act. *pereçó*, thou askedst ; *apajaçó*, thou wentst away ; *irithyó* Yt. 22, 16. thou diedst ; 2nd sg. middle v. *mai-ryaṇuḥa* Yt. 22, 34. thou diedst (from *mar*, *mere* to die) ; *uç-ṣayanha* Ys. 9, 13. thou wast born (root *zan*) ; 3rd pers. sg. act. *apereçat*, he asked, *ashnaot*, he reached, (from *ash* to reach, obtain), *frashúçat*, he stepped forward (root, *shúç*), *aç*, *aç*, he was (root *aç* to be) ; 3rd pers. sg. middle v. *fra-manyata*, he meditated, *nī-shaçta*, he sat down (root *sad* to sit), *uzdaçta*, he offered (r. *dā*), *yazata*, he worshipped (r. *yaz*), *çtayata*, he placed (causal of *çtā* to stand) ; 3rd pers. dual act. *apereçayatem* Ys. 12, 5. they two conversed, *fra-chaçshaçtem* Yt. 8, 38. they two searched after him (r. *chish*, to search, inquire) ; *pairi-avátem* Yt. 13, 77. they two were helping ; 1st pers. pl. act. *fra-vaocháma*, we pronounced (r. *vach*, to speak) ; 2nd pl. act. *taurvaṇyata*, you defeated ; 3rd act. *vaēnen*, they saw, *anhen*, *hen*, they were (r. *aç* to be) ; 3rd middle v. *fraoreñta*, they professed (r. *var* to choose, profess a religion), *advarenta*, they ran (r. *dvar* to run).

## 17.—THE PERFECT AND PLUPERFECT.

The perfect, denoting the completion of an action, does not frequently occur, neither in the usual Zend, nor in the Gâthā dialect. Example : 1st pers. sg. act. : *dādareça*, I have

seen ; *fra-dadātha*, thou hast furthered ; *vōiṣṭa*,\* thou knowest ; 3rd pers. sing. *dadha*, he has created ; *tatasha*, he has prepared (r. *tash* to cut, prepare) ; *vavacha*, he has spoken ; *āṇha*, he has been (r. *aṣ* to be) ; *tātuva*, he was able (r. *tu* to be able) ; *vivaēdha* Yt. 13, 99. he has broken (r. *vidh* to break, S. *vyadh* to slay) ; *chakana* Yt. 22, 11. he has loved (r. *kan* to love, like) ; *jighaurīa*, has given a smell (root *ghaurv* S. *ghrā* to smack). 1st pers. pl. act. *ṣuṣṛuma* Yt. 13, 48. we have heard ; *chākhrare*, they have done (r. *kar*, *kere*) ; *iririthare*, they are dead (r. *irith* to die) ; *dādhare* Yt. 19, 6. they have given. 1st pers. sg. middle v. *ṣuṣṛuyē* Yt. 17, 17. I have heard ; 2nd sg. *urūrudhusa*, thou hast grown (root *rudh* to grow) ; 3rd. *tuthruyē*, has fashioned (root *thru* to form, fashion) ; *daidhē* Yt. 5, 130. has placed.

A peculiar perfect form is *yaēshē*. Yt. 13, 99. where the reduplication is lost (the regular form would be *yēyēshē*) and, in order to compensate that loss, the vowel of the root lengthened. The root is here *yaṣ*, *yah* S. *yas*, to make efforts, handle, and to hurt, violate. In the passage alleged it means : he has damaged, hurt. Formations of this kind are frequent in Sanskrit, Latin, (*fregi* I have broken instead of *fafragi* from *frango*, I break) and the Teutonic (compare, for instance, the modern English *I held* with the gothic form *haihald* from *haldan* hold) languages.

The pluperfect is very rare ; unmistakable instances are : *jāghmat* Yt. 19, 12. he had come, *ava-jāghnāt*, he had slain ; *shushuyām* Yt. 8, 11. I had moved, *jaghmyām*, I had come (both forms being in the potential mood).

## 18.—FUTURE TENSE.

The way of expressing future time being not so settled as that of expressing the ideas of the present and past, we find various contrivances employed for answering this purpose, the number of which is greater than in any other of the cognate languages. We meet

\* Root : *vid* to know, *vaēda* I know. According to its terminations it is a mere perfect, but the meaning is that of the present ; it corresponds exactly to the Greek *oida*, I know, 2nd pers. S. *oiṣtha*.

with the forms applied in the Sanskrit, Greek and Lithuanian, as well as those used in Latin, and the ancient Teutonic languages.

The two future formations of the Sanskrit, the simple, consisting in the addition *śya* to the verbal root, and the periphrastic, compounded of a noun expressing the doer with an auxiliary verb (as for instance S. *kartā smi* lit. I am a doer, means, I shall do), are to be met with in a few instances only. Ex. *vakhshyá* Ys. 30,1. I shall tell (root *vach* to tell). It is more frequent in participle formations, e. g. *búshyantya*, what is about to be, will be, *śāhyamāna*, what is about to be born (root *śan* to produce), *udāhyamāna* what is about to be offered (root *dá*), *haoshyañta* Vis p. 9, 3. what is about to be squeezed (r. *hu* to squeeze the Homa juice). Of the other Sanskrit future formation I know only one instance in the Zend texts; *parsta* Vend 11,11. it will destroy, lit. is destroyer (root *pereth* to destroy).

Now and then we find one of the Aorists (that with *s*, *h*.) with the terminations of the present tense used for a future, e. g. *jenghaiti*, Ys. 31,14. it will come (r. *jam* to come).

In the frequent phrase Ys. 33,10. "who are, and who were, and who will be," we find the future expressed simply by *bavaiñti*, the pres. of *bú* to be. Even the imperfect of *bú* is used in that sense, e. g. *bvat*, in a shortened form, Vend 2, 5. he will be, *bun*, Vend 11, 2. they will be; in composition with a participle: *pereçemno bva*, Vend. 18, 29. I shall be asking, I shall ask.

The most common way of expressing futurity is, however, the application of the two kinds of subjunctives above mentioned (see pagg. 64.65.)

## 19.—PASSIVE FORMS.

The passive forms generally agree with those of the middle voice, except that the syllable *ya* is added to the roots. In the 3rd pers. sg. imperf. a peculiar form is to be observed, which, however, entirely agrees with the Sanskrit. Ex. *janyáonté*, they are slain (r. *jan*), *śayáonté*, they are born (r. *śan*), *vidhayéinté*, they are deposited (r. *dhá*).

3rd pers. sg. imperf. *ṣrāvī*, it was heard (*ṣru* to hear); *avāchi*, it was spoken, said; (r. *vach*), *jaini*, he was slain (r. *jan*), *erenāvi*, was obtained, (r. *ere*, to go), *mracī*, Ys. 32,14. was told (root *mrá*, to tell).

## 20.—PARTICIPLES.

In participles the Zend is as rich as any of the sister languages. Grammatically all participles being subject to declension are considered as nouns.

(a). PRESENT PARTICIPLE, ACTIVE VOICE.—It is made up by the addition of the syllable *at* (or in its fuller form *ant*) to the crude form of the present tense, as is the case in the sister languages, Sanskrit, Latin, etc. This crude form of the participle, in consequence of its always taking nominal terminations, except if forming part of a compound word, generally may be recognised not from its nominative, but from its oblique cases, or from its being part of a compound. Ex. *barat-zaothrem*, bringing an offering (consisting of sacred water), *tachāt*, Vend. 8, 100. running, in running, when running (r. *tach*, to run), *bareñtem*, accus. sg. of *barat*, *barent*, bringing; the nominative termination in *āç* e. g. *kshoyāç* Ys. 49, 12. ruling (r. *kshī* to rule), *yāçāç*, worshipping (instead of *yāç-ant-s*, *kshy-ant-s*, *s* being the sign of the nominative, compare Latin *amans*, loving, instead of *am-ant-s*). In the Gâthas we find now and then simply *aç*, e. g. *çtavaç* Ys. 45, 6. praising (r. *çtu*). In the usual Zend the nominative sounds often *ó* only, e. g. *ṣrāvayó*, praying, *açrāvayó*, not praying (instead of *ṣrāvayāç* acc. *ṣrāvayantem*), *açāchayó* Vend. 18, 5. not teaching, *açikhshó*, not learning; before *cha*, *chit* this *ó* is changed into its original form, *aç*, e. g. *jvaçchit*, if living, (r. *jiv*) to live. Instead of the termination *ant* we meet now and then, chiefly in the Gâthas, with that in *an* only, e. g. *avanhan*, dat. *avanhānē*, helping, *māthran* speaking, *çpaçánó* Vend 13, 28. nom. pl. seeing (r. *çpaç* to see), *evindánó* nom. pl. not finding (r. *vind*, to find).

(b.) PAST PARTICIPLE, ACTIVE VOICE.—It is formed in the same way as in Sanskrit and Greek, by the addition of the syllable



*vat*, sounding in its nominative case, masculine gender, generally *váo*, feminine gender *ushi*, in the oblique cases *vant* (as in the acc.), or *val* (as in the instrumental) or *ush* to the root e. g. *vid-váo* knowing (lit. one who has acquired knowledge), fem. *vid-ushi*, *vidushé* dat. sing. to ono knowing. Ex. *jaghuváo* Yt. 10, 71. having slain, defeated (r. *jan*, *ghan*, to defeat); *mamannus* Yt. 8, 39. having thought, resolved upon (root *man*), *chichithushím* Vend. 18, 69. acc. fem., having known (r. *chith* to know); *vaokushé* Yt. 13, 88. to him who has spoken (r. *vach*); *váverexushé*, to him who has wrought (root *verex* to work); *biwiváo* Yt. 11, 5. 13, 41. having become afraid, frightened (r. *bí* to fear).

(c.) PARTICIPLES OF THE FUTURE TENSE.—See above under the “future tense.”

(d.) PRESENT PARTICIPLES OF THE MIDDLE AND PASSIVE VOICES.—Of these there are two formations, of very frequent use, the one adding *ana*, and the other *mana*, or *mena*, or *mna*, to the crude form of the present tense. Ex. *pereçmana*, carrying on a conversation (root *pereç*), *frabúidhyamana*, passive Vend. 18, 49. awakened, when being awakened (r. *budh* to awaken), *vereximna*, wrought, done, *aojanó*, saying (r. *aoj*=*vach* to say), *çrayanó*, begging (r. *çri* to go for), *áçtavana* Vend. 3, 40. invoking, praising (r. *çtu*).

(e.) PAST PARTICIPLE PASSIVE VOICE.—It is formed by the addition of *ta* to the root. Its meaning is in the majority of cases a passive one; but we find it now and then used in a merely active sense, as is the case in modern Persian, also, e. g. *áçtátó*, Vend. 3, 40. reciting, *varetó* Ys. 45, 1. choosing, professing (r. *var* to choose). Examples of the passive meaning are numerous: *chitó*, known (r. *chit* to know), *beretó*, carried, *baçta* bound (r. *band* to bind), *gerepta*, seized, taken (r. *gerew*, to take) &c.

## 21.—INFINITIVE.

The infinitive mood is expressed in various ways. In the Gâthâ dialect we find the same means employed in expressing this mood, as in the Vedic language, viz. the forms ending

in *dhgái*, *dyái* and *anhé*, S. *asé*, which are, as to their true nature, datives of abstract nouns, the former meaning "for making," and the latter "for being." In the usual Zend, these forms are very rare (see Vend. 2, 24. *vazaidhyái*, to carry r. *vaz* S. *vah*); in their room we find the dative case of abstract nouns ending in *tí* or *na* used, or other means adopted for supplying the want of the old proper infinitives. Ex. from the Gâthas: *verezidyái*, to work, *çrúidyái*, to hear (roots *verex* and *çru*, *dazdyái*, to give (r. *dá* reduplicated, instead of *dad-dyái*), *vziredyái* Ys. 43, 12. to step forward, to appear (r. *ere*, *ir*, to go), *mereñgedyái* Ys. 46, 11 to kill (r. *mereñch*); *râshayanhé* Ys. 49, 3. to hurt, damage (r. *rash*, to hurt), *nîpâonhé* Ys. 28, 12. in order to protect (r. *pá*, to protect) &c. A peculiar form is *dávói* Ys. 28, 3, to give (r. *dá*). Examples from the usual Zend: *paítistátéé* Vend 20, 3. to resist, withstand; *anumatayaécha anukhtayaécha* Ys. 8, 7. in order to think accordingly, and in order to speak accordingly (from *man* to think, and *vach* to speak); *ava-histéé*, in order to stand; *bavat perené paçvām*, Vend 2, 8. he was to fill (the earth) with cattle (r. *pere*, to fill).

Even some traces of the modern Persian infinitive in *tan*, the ancient form of which was *tana*, as we can ascertain from the ancient Persian cuneiform inscriptions, are occasionally met with, e. g. *añtare páperetâné*,\* in order to fight.

Now and then the middle voice participle is used to express the infinitive mood, e. g. *nâshemuái* Ys. 9, 30. to remove, destroy, *çraêshemuó* Vend 13, 17. in order to attack.

## 22.—GERUNDIAL FORMS.

These are much fewer than in Sanskrit. The absolute indeclinable gerunds in *trá* or *ya*, so extremely frequent in Sanskrit, are never found in Zend; there the gerunds are used only as declinable words, qualifying substantives, or if they are without a

\* The root is here not *peret*, but *pere*, to destroy, the intensive form of which sounds *pápere*, to attempt, to destroy, fight a battle.

substantive, the neutral form is chosen. The termination of these forms is in *ya*. Ex. *yâ karshya* Vend. 3, 24. which (the earth) is to be ploughed; *ayaozhvya bavaiñti* Vend. 3, 14. they are not to be purified; *paitirichya daithe* Ys. 11, 7. I put to be abandoned, (all bad things); *narem âctârayañtim âonhat* Vend. 5, 7. it were to punish a man (*âctâray*, causal of *çtere* to spread, means, to undergo a punishment, to atone); *bareçman frastairyât*, from the Barsom to be spread; *mâ mereñchainis gaétháo* Vend. 8, 21. the fields are not to be devastated.

### 23.—NOUNS (SUBSTANTIVES AND ADJECTIVES) THEIR FORMATION AND GENDERS.

Nouns are formed out of roots by addition of suffixes; now and then the root itself serves expressing the nominal idea, as we have shown above. There are three genders in Zend, as in the sister tongues, viz. masculine, feminine and neuter. Here I shall briefly enumerate the chief suffixes applied in the Zend to the formations of nouns; they agree wholly with those of the cognate languages.

*a*, one of the most common suffixes, forms substantives as well as adjectives; if its nominative case sounds *ô* (a change of *a-s*; *s* being the characteristic of the nominative sg.), it is a masculine; if it sounds *a* (instead of *ô*), it is a feminine; if *em* (S. *am*, Latin *um*, Greek *on*), it is a neuter, e. g. *viçpa* all (S. *viçva*) masc. *viçpô*, fem. *viçpa* (instead of *viçpô*), neuter *viçpem*; masc. *gaosh-ô*, ear, *maêgh-ô*, cloud, (the crude forms are *gaosh-a*, *maêgh-a*), *çact-ô*, hand, *daévo* devil; fem. *çaka*, light (r. *çuch* to light, shine), *izha*, nourishment, *gena*, wife (S. *gnâ*, Greek *gynê*).

*i* forms substantives as well as adjectives, e. g. *gair-i* masc., a mountain, *çair-i* masc. gold; *khshathri*, fem. a lady, *daéna*, religion. In adjectives it is a feminine termination, e. g. *mâzdayaçni-s* fem. adj., "what refers to a Mazdayasna" or worshipper of Ahuramazda (the ancient name of the Parsees), *daéna zarathustri*

adjec. fem., "what refers to Zarathustra"; *daēvi*, a female devil (S. *devī*).

*u* forms substantives and adjectives, e. g. *anhu*, life (r. *aç*, to be), *bān-u*, arm *ereñ-u*, finger, *pour-u*, much (S. *pur-u*, Greek *poly*), *vour-u* wide (S. *ur-u*, Greek *εγρύ*), *voh-u*, good (S. *vas-u*).

*an* forms substantives expressing the doer, e. g. *tash-an*, cutter (r. *tash*, to cut), *urv-an*, soul, literal: breather (r. *vā* to blow, *ur-vā*, blow from the body, i. e. to breathe); their gender is masculine.

*ana* forms abstract nouns, neuter gender (nom. sg. therefore, sounding always *auem*, pl. *ana*), e. g. *maēth-ana*, building, *maç-ana*, greatness, *vayh-ana* excellence, *raoch-ana*, window.

*āni* forms feminines of masculines terminating in *a*; e. g. *ahur-āni* Ys. 68. a female genius, the feminine of *ahura*\* (compare the S. *Indrāni*, *Varunāni*, the respective wives of *Indra* and *Varuna*).

*anā*, sounding in the nominative always *ó*, forms abstract nouns in the neuter gender, e. g. *man-anā*, mind (nom. *manó*, genit. *mananāó*, S. *man-as*, Greek *men-os*, Latin *mens*), *nem-anā*, praise, worship, a bow, (r. *nam* to bow, turn, S. *namas*), *av-anā*, help, *rafen-anā*, pleasure. All these formations can be made adjectives by lengthening the *a* of *anā* (nom. sing. *áo*) e. g. *vach-áo*, speaking, from *vach-anā*, speech; *manáo*, minded, from *man-anā*, mind.

*are* corresponding as well as the preceding suffix *anā* to S. *as*, is confined to the nominative sg. only, while the oblique cases agree entirely with those of the nouns ending in *as*. Ex: *vad-are* Ys. 9, 30. a blow, stroke (S. *badha*), *zav-are*, strength, *rāñ-are*, rule, *duçv-are* gift, *vañdv-are*, possession, treasure.

*at*, *ant* forms adjectives; the feminine terminates in *ti*, o. g. *berez-at*, high, fem. *bereti*; in the nom. masc. *at*, with the characteristic *s* (*at-s*), is changed into *ó*, e. g. *beret-ó* Yt. 14, 12.

\* The word *Ahur-āni* does not mean a wife of *Ahuramazda*, *ahura* being in the Zend-Avesta an epithet, meaning living, immortal, and is applied to all genii indiscriminately and to heroes equally. The full name of God in the Zend-Avesta is always *Ahuramazda*; he is the only one, having no wife as the Hindoo deities.

This suffix is applied to the formation of participles, as we have seen above.

*in* forming substantives and adjectives, e. g. *kain-in*, nom. sing. *kain-is*, pl. *kain-inó*, girl; *peren-in*, pl. *peren-inó* Yt. 10, 119. winged (adject. from *perenem*, wing).

*ka* forms substantives, e. g. *mahr-ka*, death (r. *màre* to die), *pairi-ka*, a fairy, *maskyá-ka*, a man (very likely diminutive) from *mashya*, man.

*ma*, *man*, of very frequent use, forms both abstract and concrete nouns; those formed by *ma* (nom. *mó*) are in the masc. gender, e. g. *dah-ma* (s. *das-ma*), a pious man,\* and those which take *man* (nom. *ma*), are in the neuter gender. Ex. *barsç-man* the Barsom, *maçç-man*, urine, *dá-man* creature, *chash-man*, eye, (compare the Latin neuter nouns in *men* as *car-men*, a poem, *tenta-men*, a trial).

*na*, *nu* form substantives. Ex. *yaç-na*, prayer, worship, *vare-na*, choice, creed, *rash-nu*, righteousness, *taf-nu* heat, *baresn-nu* summit.

*ra* forms adjectives, e. g. *khúra*, cruel.

*tha*, fem., *them*, neuter, form abstract nouns, e. g. *gaé-tha*, a field walled in, *gá-tha*, song, *mahrka-them* killing, ruin, *fráda-them*, thriving; *ti* fem. makes abstract nouns as well as *thwem* (neuter), e. g. *yés-ti* worship (r. *yaç*), *anukh-ti* speaking accordingly, *armai-ti* devotedness and the sacred name of the earth, *mā-thwem* thinking, *stao-thwem*, praising, *vā-thwem* abundance, (in flocks).

*tu* (mostly masculine) forms concrete and abstract nouns, e. g. *ra-tu*, master, chief, *khra-tu*, intellect, *zan-tu* a tribe, a town.

*tar*, masc. (nom. *ta*) characterises the doer of any thing, e. g. *dá-tu* (r), giver, creator, *thrá-ta* (r) protector, *pi-ta* (r) father (lit. protector, r. *pá* to protect); compare the Latin and Greek nouns in *tor*, e. g. *da-tor* a giver. The feminine of these nouns is *thri-s* e. g. *dáthri-s*, a she giver.

\* The Dastours understand by it a "priest," in opposition to a layman.

*thra* makes masculines (*thró*) as well as neuter (*threm*) nouns, e. g. *puthró*, a son, *grao-threm*, hearing, *gá-threm*, singing.

*tát* fem. forms abstract nouns e. g. *amere-tát* immortality, *drva-tát*, firmness, health, *ukhshyāṣ-tát* growth, *nerēṣṣāṣ-tát* waning (compare the Latin abstract nouns in *tát* o. g. *veri-tas*, truth, gen. *veritat-is*).

*ya*, of very frequent occurrence, forms relative adjectives, pointing out a certain relationship to their substantives, e. g. *yéṣnya* what refers to prayers, *dháir-ya* what refers to ahura, *túir-ya*, the fourth, &c.

*vat*, *mat* (nom. masc. *váo*, fem. *vati*, neut. *vaṣ*) very common, form adjectives, meaning "having, provided with," e. g. *haomavat*, having Homa, with Homa, *gao-mat* having milk, with milk, *amaváo* masc. *ama-vati* fem., *ama-vat*, neut. having strength, power, powerful.

## 24.—DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

### COMPARATIVES AND SUPERLATIVES.

There are two sets of suffixes employed for the formation of the degrees of comparison, which agree wholly with those used in the Sanskrit and Greek: *yañh* (nom. sg. *yáo*) m., *yahi* f., *yañh* n. (nom. sg. *yó*), and *tara* (nom. sg. *taró* m., *tara* f., *tarem* n.) for the comparatives; *ista* (nom. sg. *istó* m., *ista* f., *istem* n.) and *tema* (nom. sg. *temó* m., *tema* f., *temem* n.) for the superlatives.

Ex.: *vohu* good, comp.: *vahyáo* m. (in the Gáthas *vaqyáo*), *vahyéhi* f., *vahyó*, *vanhó* n. better, sup.: *vahistó* m., *vahista* f., *vahistem* n. best; *max*, *maṣ* great (S. *mah*, Latin *mag-nus*, Greek *meg-a*), comp.: *maṣyáo* m., *maṣyéhi* f., *maṣyó* n., greater, sup.: *maxistó* m., *maxista* f., *maxistem* n., greatest; *kaṣu*, little, comp.: *kaṣyáo* m., *kaṣyéhi* f., *kaṣyó* n., less, fewer, sup.: *kaṣistó*, a, *em* least; *ṣpan*, *ṣpen* (r. *ṣvi* to thrive) thriving, excellent, comp.: *ṣpanyáo* m., more excellent, *ṣpenistó* most excellent.

Examples of the other set of comparative and superlative suffixes are the following: *ushaṣ-tara* more eastward, *daoshaṣtara* more westward, *jāthwó-tara* more baneful; *amavaṣ-tema* the strongest, *ápótema* most abundant in water, *yátumaṣ-tema*, being best conversant with sorcery, *urvaró-tema* having most of trees, &c.

## 25.—COMPOUND NOUNS.

The Zend language is as rich in compound words of various kinds as its ancient sister tongues, Sanskrit and Greek, but, on account of its standing nearest to the more simple Vedic idiom, less artificial in this respect than the classical Sanskrit. I forego the numerous compositions of prepositions with nouns which would more properly belong to a dictionary than to a short grammatical sketch. Following Sanskrit grammar we may bring these compound words under five heads.

1.—COPULATIVE COMPOUNDS (*Dvandva* in Sanskrit) of comparatively rare occurrence, e. g. *paçvîra* (dual) Yt. 13, 12. cattle (and) man (*paçu*, cattle, *vîra*, man), *Frashaostrâjâmâçpâ* Ys. 12, 7, Frashoster (and) Jâmâsp.\*

2.—ADJECTIVE COMPOUNDS, being a composition of an adjective with a noun, e. g. *pounu-aênáo* Ys. 32, 6. many sins, evils; *daregâyû* 28, 7. two long lives (*darega*, long, *âyû* life, the life of the body and that of the soul.)

3.—COMPOUNDS OF DEPENDENCY, where one part, generally the first, depends upon the other. This class comprises combinations of nouns with nouns (the first then is to be resolved into the genitive case), e. g. *danhu-paiti*, master of the country, governor, (*danhu*, country, *paiti*, master, lord), *vîçpê mazista* Ys. 33, 5. the greatest of all; or of nouns with present (or its equivalent) and past participles, e. g. *çraoshô-pâta* protected (*pâta*) by Serosh, *frâdat-gaêtha*, making the fields thrive (*frâdat*, making thrive, pres. partic.), *duêrvô-zusta* loved by the devils, *mithah-vacháo*, telling lies, *erezh-vacháo*, telling the truth, *çpô-bereta*, carried by a dog. In these compounds we often observe the peculiarity of a vowel, which is *ó*, inserted between the first and second parts, e. g. *zrvô-dâtu*, created in the time (*zrvô* is to be traced to *zarvan*, time), *baghó-bakhta* ordained by fate.†

\* Both words are in the dual, and are wholly analogous to the Vedic compounds *Mitrâ-Varund.* i. e. Mitra (and) Varuna (gods).

† *Zrvô* and *baghó* are, as to the sense, to be taken in the instrumental case, *zrvô* therefore, stands instead of *zrra*, "through the time," and *baghó* is put instead of *bagha*, "through fate."

4.—POSSESSIVE COMPOUNDS, belong to any of the preceding classes, but are solely employed in qualifying substantives ; they are, therefore, mere adjectives, e. g. *bareçmô-zaçta* having Barsom in his hand, *zairi-gaona*, of golden colour, gold coloured, *hazanrô-çtûnem* having thousand pillars (a palace), *voruru-gaoyaoitis* (in the Vedic Sanserit *gavyûti* pasturage) having large pasturages, fields (an epithet of *Mithra*).

5.—PARTICLE-COMPOUNDS. I shall confine myself here to some remarks on certain inseparable prefixes and some adverbs only, and forego the prepositions which serve chiefly the purpose of modifying the verbal notions, expressed by the roots.

Among the inseparable prefixes stands foremost *a* or *an* (if the word, to which it is prefixed, commences with a vowel), the well known negative particle of the ancient Arian languages ; it always negatives the existence of the idea, expressed by the word to which it is prefixed, e. g. *a-tbistô*, not to be hated, annoyed, i. e. friendly, peaceful, *a-çrâçayat*, not reciting (the sacred prayers) i. e. infidel ; *an-aiuidrukhtô* one who does not belie (*Mithra*), *an-ashava* not religious, impious, *an-âhita* not polluted, i. e. clear (an epithet of the genius presiding over the waters).

*aç*, *as*, very, exceedingly, e. g. *aç-khratus* very intelligent, wise, *aç-varethrajâstemô* Yt. 10, 98. the most victorious, *as-frâyasti* with a great multitude, i. e. with a great many Yt. 10, 77.

*hu*, well, *dus*, ill (S. *su*, *dus*) e. g. *hu-matem* well thought, *dus-matem* ill-thought, *hûkhtem* (instead of *hu-ûkhtem*) well spoken, *duzh-ûkhtem* ill spoken, *hvarstem* (instead of *hu-varstem*) well done, *duzh-varstem*, ill done, *hu-kereta* well formed &c.

*frâyô*, often, repeatedly, always, e. g. *frâyô humatô* Yt. 11, 20. always thinking of good, *frâyô-hûkhtô*, always speaking of good.

*vi*, against, expresses a separation, removal, e. g. *vi-daërô\** against the devils, for the removal of the devils ; *vi-âpôtemem*, most devoid of water.

*hama*, *hâma* (S. *sama*, *sâma*, Pers. *ham*), the same, equal, e. g. *hama-gaona* of the same colour, *hâma-takhma* equally swift.

\* The first part of the word *Vendiddd* in Zend : *vi-daërô-ddâtem*, i. e. what is given in order to remove the devils, to be guarded against their influences.



## 26.—INFLECTION OF NOUNS; NUMBERS AND CASES.

The Zend, like Sanskrit and Greek, has besides the SINGULAR and PLURAL, a peculiar formation to express a duality, which is called DUAL. All these three numbers are modified in various ways by cases, of which we find exactly as many as in Sanskrit, viz. eight, including the vocative. In the sg. and pl. (except the vocative in pl., and the accus. in neuter nouns) each case has generally its own termination; but in the dual, one and the same form is used to express several different cases. In Sanskrit the eight cases are expressed in the dual by three forms only; but in Zend we find five forms, a richness to be discovered in no other language of the Arian stock. I shall enumerate them in the Sanskrit order. 1, the NOMINATIVE; 2, the ACCUSATIVE; 3, the INSTRUMENTAL, expressing the ideas of "with, through, by;" 4, the DATIVE; 5, the ABLATIVE, meaning "from, out of," pointing out the origin of a thing; 6, the GENITIVE; 7, the LOCATIVE, corresponding to "in, at, on;" 8, the VOCATIVE.

I shall illustrate the use of these by a few examples. Nom. : *mraot ahuró mazdáo*, Ahuramazda said. Acc. : *ahurem mazdām yazumaide*, Ahuramazda we worship. Instr. : *upazóit aspahé astraya*, he may beat (him) with a horsewhip; dat. : *fryó fryái daidit*, a friend gave to a friend. Abl. : *tem khshathrát móithat*, Ys. 46, 4. him from possession (*khshatrát*) he turned out; *yús daéva akát manafhó glá chithrem*, ye devils! you are offspring from the evil mind (*akát manafhó*). Gen. : *puthró ahuraké mazdáo*, son of Ahuramazda (the fire); *dátare gaéthanām*, creator of the fields. Loc. : *tem yazata Zarathustró manahi*, Yt. 14, 11. Zarathustra worshipped him in his mind; *višpaéshu vanhushu* in all the good men. Voc. : *dátare*, O creator! *Ardivi gúra anáhité*, Ardooisoor Anáitis!

As to inflexion, all nouns may be divided into two chief classes, which have several sub-divisions; the first comprises all those nouns, the crude forms of which terminate in a consonant, the second those the crude forms of which end in a vowel. The terminations, if joined to the latter, must naturally undergo some

changes; from which reason the true form of the cases can be ascertained from such nouns only as end in consonants. Chiefly according to this class of nouns, I shall give here a list of the terminations.

	SINGULAR.	DUAL.	PLURAL.
Nom.	<i>s</i>	{ <i>a</i>	<i>ô (aç)</i>
Ac.	<i>em</i>	{ <i>a</i>	<i>ô, âs</i>
Ins.	<i>a</i>	{ <i>tya</i>	<i>bis</i>
Dat.	<i>ê</i>	{ <i>bya</i>	<i>byô (byaç)</i>
Abl.	<i>at</i>	{ <i>áo</i>	<i>byô</i>
Gen.	<i>ô (aç)</i>	{ <i>áo</i>	<i>ãm</i>
Loc.	<i>i</i>	<i>yô</i>	<i>aêshu, aêshva, hva</i>
Voc.	like the nom.	"	"

## 27.—DECLENSION OF NOUNS TERMINATING IN A CONSONANT.

(A). In a guttural or palatal sound. The palatal remains only before the terminations which commenced with vowels, but if they begin with a consonant, it is to be changed into a corresponding guttural, viz. *kh* before *s*, and *gh* before *b*. Thus we obtain from the crude forms, *vách*, voice, *druj*, destruction, the nominatives *vákh-s*, *drukḥ-s*, while the accns. are *vách-em*, *drujem*; in the dat. pl. *byô*, *vách* inserts *zh*: *vaghzhe-byô*, Yt. 10, 88. to the voices, words. The other cases are generally supplied by the related *vachô* word.

(B). In a labial. *p* before the *s* of the nom. becomes *f*, e. g. *áf-s*, water (crude form *áp*, Latin *aqua*), acc. *ápen*; *áp-ô*, *apô*, gen. sing.; *áp-ô*, nom. and acc. pl.; *áp-ãm*, gen. pl.; *ápa* dual. *kerf-s*, nom. sg. shape; flesh; acc. *kehrp-em*;\* instr. *kehrp-a* (comp. Latin *corpus*). Before *y* the *p* can be further changed into *u*, e. g. *aiw-yô*, dat. pl. (a contraction of *aiwibýô* 'to the waters').

\* The *h* is merely euphonical, serving no grammatical purpose.

(C). In a sibilant as *ç*, e. g. *vîç* a village, a quarter (comp. Latin *vicus*, S. *viç*, Greek *oikos*, a house), acc. *vîç-em*, dat. *vîçê*, nom. pl. *vîç-ô*, gen. pl. *vîç-ãm*; before the soft *b*, *ç* is changed into the corresponding *zh*, e. g. *vîzhibyô* (dat. pl.) Ys. 53, 8.

(D). In *anh*. This class is very frequent; all are of the neuter gender; the nom. terminates in *ô*, which becomes *aç* before the enclitic particle *cha* e. g. *manaçcha* "and the mind;" the oblique cases mostly end in *anh*. Ex. *mananh*, mind, nom. and acc. *manô*; instr. *mananha*, dat. *mananhê*, gen. *mananhô*, abl. *mananhat*, loc. *manahi*; pl. nom. and acc. *çraváo* sayings (from the crude form *çravanh*, nom. sing. *çravô*), gen. *çravanhãm*, inst. *raochê-bis* (from *raochanh*, light), *çravâis* (from *çravanh*, as if *çrava* were the crude form,) *vachê-bis* (from *vachanh*, nom. *vachô*, word), loc. *raochô-hea*, Yt. 22, 15. (from *raoch-anh*). From these forms we may see, that *anh* is kept before such terminations only as commence with a vowel, before the terminations beginning with consonants, *ô* or *ê* being substituted. The nom. and acc. pl. is *áo*, a contraction of a fuller form.

The adjective forms in *áo*, being always traceable to such an abstract in *anh*, follow the same rule; e. g. *raocháo*, having light, shining, from *raochanh* light, forms the acc. sg. masc. *raochanhem*, a termination which is never to be found in the abstract nouns in *anh* themselves on account of their being in the neuter gender.

(E). Masc. in *an*, *van*, e. g. *urvan* m. soul, *zarvan*, m. time, *ashavan* m. *ashaoni* f. (contraction of *ashavan-i*) adj. pious, religious. The chief peculiarity of the inflexion of the nouns consists in dropping the *a* and changing *v* into the vowel *u* before all the oblique cases of the singular, except the acc., and the oblique cases of the plural, except those, terminations of which commence with a consonant, like the dat. and instr. pl. In the nom. sing. the *n* drops, but the *a* remains; in the acc. sing. and nom. pl. both remain, *a* being then lengthened to *ã*.

Ex. *urvan*, soul, *zrvan*, *zarvan*, time, *adhvan*, path, *atharvan*, a priest, *ashavan*, religious, pure.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>urva</i> , <i>zrva</i> ( <i>zarva</i> ), <i>áthrava</i>	<i>urvānō</i>
Acc.	<i>urvānem</i> , <i>zrvānem</i> , <i>ashavanem</i>	<i>urunō</i> ( <i>açcha</i> )
Inst.	<i>ashavana</i>	<i>urvōibyo</i>
Dat.	<i>urunē</i> , <i>ashaonē</i> (before <i>cha</i> : <i>ae</i> , <i>urunaēcha</i> )	<i>ashavabyō</i>
Abl.	<i>urunō</i> , <i>-aç</i> ( <i>cha</i> ), <i>ashannat</i>	<i>ashavabyō</i>
Gen.	<i>urunō</i> , <i>athaurunō</i> , <i>zrvānahe</i> *	<i>urunām</i>
Loc.	<i>zruni</i> , Vend 19, 9 "in the time"	<i>ashaonām</i>

Dat. dual *ashavanaēibya*, Ys. 1, 11.

The feminine of *ashavan* is *ashaoni*, to be declined like a fem. in *i*; see below.

**F** In *an*, *man*, (neuter and masc.); in the nom. and acc. sing. the final *n* drops always; the nom. and acc. pl. is either equal to the sg., or *i* (in which case the whole termination assumes the shape of *ēni*, e. g. *nāmēni*, names, from *nāman*, a name; compare. S. *āni* in *nāmāni*, the names, from *nām-an*, a name), is added to *ān*; now and then, *ān* alone remains, e. g. *dām-ān*, creatures, from *dām-a* (*n*) a creature, preserved in the modern Persian interrogative pronoun : *kudām ī*. e. what creature—who? which?

Ex. *bareç-man* Barsom, *nām-an*, a name, *maēç-man* urine, *airyaman*, friend, associate, and a proper name.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>bareçma</i> , n. <i>airyēmā</i> , m.	<i>bareçma</i> , <i>nāmēnī</i>
Acc.	<i>airyamanem</i>	
Inst.	<i>bareçmana</i>	
Dat.	<i>bareçmainē</i>	<i>dāmabyō</i>
Abl.	<i>bareçman</i>	
Gen.	<i>bareçmanō</i>	<i>dāmanām</i>
Loc.	<i>bareçman</i> , <i>ānmaini</i> G., in the soul,	<i>bareçmōhu</i>

\* This genitive form (it ought to sound *zrunō* which I never met with) is to be traced to a crude form ending in *u*, *zredna*, derived from the original *zrvan* by means of the suffix *a*.

## DUAL.

Nom. and acc. *raçmana*, the two battle lines ; dat. and instr. *açmanaçibya\** Visp. 10,2. to the two stones, loc. *raçmaoyô* in the two battle lines.

(G). In *ar*, *tar* ; *a* is weak and often left out, as may be seen from the paradigma. In the nom. sg. the *r* is generally silent, always in such nouns, as denote the doer of an action and signify the nearest kinsmen, as *dâ-tar*, creator, *pâ-tar*, protector, *pi-tar*, father, *mâ-tar*, mother, *brâtar*, brother, *qanh-ar* (S. *svasar*) sister, *dugh-dhar* daughter, the nom. sg. being *pâta*, *pita*, *mâta*, *qanha*, &c. In *âtar* fire (its root is uncertain) the usual termination of the nom. sg. *s* is added to *ar*, as *âtar-s* (modern Persian *atesh*, fire).

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>âtars</i> , <i>dâta</i> , <i>pita</i> , ( <i>plâ</i> G.)	<i>âturô</i> , <i>dâtârô</i> .
Acc.	<i>âtarem</i> , <i>dâtârem</i> , <i>pitarem</i>	<i>âtarô</i>
Inst.	<i>âthrâ</i> , G.	
Dat.	<i>âthré</i> ( <i>âécha</i> ), <i>pi thré</i> , <i>brâ thré</i>	<i>âterebyô</i>
Abl.	<i>âthrat</i> , <i>pi thré</i> ( <i>ô</i> ) G.	
Gen.	<i>âthrô</i> ( <i>açcha</i> ), <i>dâ thrô</i>	<i>âthrām</i> , <i>dâ thranām</i>
Loc.		
Voc.	<i>âtare</i> , <i>dâtare</i> , in compounds <i>âtare</i> .	

## Dual.

Nom. and acc. *pâtâra*, Yt. 14, 45. the two protectors.\*  
*thwôrestâra*, Ys. 42, 2, the two creators.†  
*zâmâtara-qaçura*, Yt. 10, 116. the son-in-law  
 (and) father-in-law.  
*brâthra*, Yt. 10, 116. the two brothers.

(H) in *tât* fem. The final *t* is often dropped. In the nom. sg. the whole termination is left out, and *âo* substituted ; e. g. the nom. sg. of *haurvatât*, wholesomeness, health, is *haurvâo* (before *cha* "and" : *haurvâoçcha*, Ys. 34, 11), that of *drvatât* health, *drvâo*. In the nom. and acc. pl. *tât* is now and then preserved ; e. g. *ameretâtaç-*

\* The original meaning of *açman* is rock, stone, then the firmament ; the modern Persian *azmân*, sky, is traced to it.

† These are the two creative powers, combined in Ormuzd, the Supreme deity, as we shall see in the 4th chapter.

*cha*, and the immortalities (crude form *ameretát*), Ys. 31, 6; but in *haurvató* acc. pl., it is lost. The gen. sg. is *ameretátō*, *haurvatátō*, *drvatátō*; acc. sg. *drvatátēm*, *ameretátēm*; loc. *ameretátī* Ys. 45, 7. Pretty frequent is the nom. and acc. dual *haurvatá* *ameretátá* (a Dvandva compound) "health (and) immortality"; the dat. dual is *āmeretatbya*; the gen. dual *haurvatáōs* (*cha*) *ameretátáō*, Visp. 9, 5.

(I) In *in*. The *n* drops in the nominative; the *i* is not made long as is the case in Sanskrit, but remains either short or is changed into *é*.

Ex. *kainin*, a girl, *perenin*, winged; nom. sg. *kainé* (perhaps a contraction of *kanya*, acc. *kanyām*); acc. sg. *kaininem*; gen. sg. *kaininó* and *kanyáo*, nom. pl. *pereninó*, *kainyó*, *kainina*, Yt. 17, 54.; dative pl. *kainibyo*, Ys. 53, 5.

(K) In *ant*, *vant*, *mant*, see above the present participles, active voice. The nom. sg. m. of the adjectives in *vant*, *mant*, always terminates in *váo*, *máo*, the fem. is *vati*, *mati*, the neuter *vat*, *mat*. The acc. sg. masc. and the nom. pl. have the full form *ant* before the termination; in the other cases of the sg. *n* can be omitted, but chiefly in the present participle, it is often to be met with; in the oblique cases of the plural this *n* is generally left out.

Ex. *barant*, bearing, *dadant*, giving, *açtvant*, endowed with bodies, *bánumant* shining, *berezant* high, *dregvant* (nom. *váo*), wicked (a word used in the Gáthas only), *kanant*, awarding, (r. *han*), *çaoshyant*, an ancient fire-priest, a prophet, *drvant*, running (applied to ghosts and evil spirits, r. *dru* to run).

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>dadāç</i> , <i>açtváo</i> , <i>berezó</i> , <i>dregváo</i> <i>çaoshyāç</i>	<i>çaoshyañtó</i> , <i>dregvañtó</i> , <i>bere- zañtó</i> , <i>berezanta</i> Yt. 5, 13.
Acc.	<i>bareñtem</i> , <i>açtvañtem</i> , <i>dreg- vañtem</i>	<i>çaoshyañtó</i> , <i>berezañta</i> , Yt. 10, 145, <i>çurunvataçcha</i> (those who have heard.)

Inst.	<i>dregvátá</i> G., <i>berezata</i>	<i>dregvódebis</i> , G.
Dat.	<i>haneñlé, dregváté</i> G., <i>dregvátó (cha)</i> G., <i>drvatáé (cha)</i>	<i>dregvódebyó.</i>
Abl.	<i>açvatat</i>	
Gen.	<i>açvató, bánumató, berezató</i>	<i>berezatām, dregvatām, drvatām,</i>
Loc.	<i>bareñti, açvaiñti</i>	<i>pishyaçu,*</i> Ys. 50, 2, in the seeing ones, <i>dregvaçu</i> , G. (instead of <i>dregvatçu</i> ).

(L) in *vanh*, *vas*, nom. *váo*; in the oblique cases *vas* is mostly changed into *ush*, e. g. *dadhváo*, having created, then creator (a name of Ahuramazda), acc. *dadhváonhem*, gen. sing. *dathushó*; nom. *vidváo*, knowing, gen. *vidushó*; abl. *dathushat*; dat. sg. *vidushé*, *vaokushé* (from *vaochváo*, one who has spoken); gen. pl. *vidvaéshām* (formed according to the pronominal declension).

## 28.—DECLENSION OF NOUNS TERMINATING IN VOWELS.

### MASCULINE AND NEUTER NOUNS IN *a*.

The inflexion of the masculine and neuter nouns in *a*, differs in the nom. acc. of the sing. and pl. only, while all other cases are equal. In the neuter gender the nom. and acc. have always one and the same termination, in the sing. *em*, in the pl. *a*, as is the case in Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek also.

\* Root *pish-yaç*, to see (*hvaré-pishyaçó*, in those who see the sun i. e. live).

**SINGULAR.**—The nom. terminates always in *ó*, which is a phonetical change of *a-s*; before the enclitical particle *cha*, which is generally affixed to a word, the original form in the shape of *aç* remains, e. g. *ahuró*, *ahuraçcha*. The acc. ends always in *em*; if the last syllable of the word be *ya*, it is contracted to *i*, if *aya*, it is made *é*.

The instrumental terminates in the bare crude form, the termination being lost; the dat. has *ái*, before *cha*: *aé*; the abl. *át*, *dat*.

The genitive termination differs from the preceding class; its termination is *ahya*, *aqya*, in the Gâthas (*asya* in S.), and *ahé* in the classical Zend; the loc. ends in *é*. The vocative terminates in the crude form, e. g. *ahura*!

**DUAL:** nom. and acc. *a* (in the Gâthas *d*), and *é*, e. g. *pádha*, the two feet, *zaçlé*, the two hands, *duyé çailé*, two hundred; instr. *bya*, *zaçtaéibya*, with the two hands, *havanaéibya*, with the two Homa utensils (the mortar and beater); dative *aiwé*, e. g. *pádhaiwé*, to the two feet, *gaoshaiwé*, to the two ears, Yt. 16, 7.; abl. *yáo*, e. g. *pádhayáo*, from the two feet, *gaoshayáo* from the two ears, Yt. 10, 23.; gen. *yáo*, e. g. *virayáo* in the Dvandva: *paçváo virayáo*\* of both cattle and men, Visp. 7, 3.; loc. *ayó*, as *zaçtayó*, into the two hands. From these statements we can see, that the Zend is richer in Dual forms than any other of the cognate languages; Sanskrit has only three and Greek only two, but Zend has five distinct forms for the cases of the dual.

**PLURAL.**—The nominative masculine terminates in *donhó* (identical with *ásas* in the Vedic Sanskrit) and *a*; the neuter always in *a*. The acc. ends in *ā*, *ān*, (*ās*, *āç*, before *cha*), *é*, (*éç* before *cha*) and simply *a*, e. g. *açmā*, pieces of wood, *haomān*, the Homas, *puhré*, children, *mazisté* Visp. 3, 5. greatest, *ameshēçcha ápeñtē*, and the Amshashpands (archangels), *mashyāçcha* and the men.

In the Gâthas we find the peculiar form in *ēñg*, which is, I think, only a harsher pronunciation of *āç*, e. g. *viçpeñg*, all, *daēvēñg* the devils, *mashyēñg* men, &c.

\* The Dual is put twice, each part of the Dvandva (copulative compound) is provided with it, as is generally the case in such compounds, see page 90.



The instr. ends in *áís*, as in Sanskrit, e. g. *māthráís*, through the sacred prayers. The dative terminates in *byó*, which is identical with the first class of nouns. The gen. ends in *anām* (S. *án m*). The loc. termination is *aéshu*, *aéshva*, *fshva* (comp. *kamnafshvá*, Ys. 46, 2, "among the few;" from *kamna*, few). The vocative is identical with the nominative.

Ex. : *ahura*, living (a name of god), *mazda* (although the nom. is *mazdáo*, it is inflected like those nouns, the nominatives of which end in *ó*) creator, \* *gaya*, possession, existence, *mashya*, man, *asha*, truth, *zarathustra*, Zoroaster, *dátu*, given, created, *çpitama*, the family name of Zoroaster, *khshathra*, rule, *urvátem*, a revealed saying, *xaosha*, pleasure, *urvaéça*, end, *mithra*, friend, promise, *mareta*, mortal.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>ahuró mazdáo, ashem, zarathustró, mazdáoçcha</i>	<i>ahuráonhó</i> , Ys. 30, 9. <i>mazdáonhó</i> , Ys. 45, 1. <i>çpitamáonhó, duéva, urváta</i>
Acc.	<i>ahurem, mazdām, xarathustrem, mashim, gaém</i>	<i>haomā</i> , &c. see above.
Inst.	<i>asha, khshathra</i>	<i>khshathráís, mashyáís, urvátáís</i>

\* Burnouf's explanation of the name *mazda* by the Sanskrit *medhá*, wise, which I followed myself also, did not prove satisfactory to me on further researches. That the word in phonetical respect is identical with the Sanskrit, *medhá*, is not to be denied; but the original meaning of it is not "wise." Were it the case, we ought to suppose it to be a contraction of *maiti-dhá*, "producing wisdom;" but *maiti* (thought, wisdom = S *matí*) is generally suffixed, not prefixed to another word, e. g. *taró-maiti*, perverse thought, i. e. disobedience; but the word *mat* "with" is very frequently prefixed to other words. If added to *dhá*, creating, it must be changed according to the phonetical laws into *mazdáo*. The general meaning of *mat* being "together, all" (see Visp. 14, 1.) the word *mazdáo* means either the joint creator, or the creator of all. That may be clearly seen from Ys. 45, 1.

Dat.	<i>ahurái mazdái, ashái, zarathustrái</i>	<i>mithróibyó, maretaéibyó</i>
Abl	<i>ashát, asháat</i>	<i>anáhitaéibyó, Yt. 10, 38. (unpolluted)</i>
Gcn.	<i>mazdáō, ahurakyá, ahura- hé, ashahé, zarathus- trahé</i>	<i>daévanām, vīspanām</i>
Loc.	<i>zaoshé, urvaéché</i>	<i>mashyaéshu, naptyaéshu (re- lations), maretaéshu</i>
Voc.	<i>ahura, mazda, zarathustra,</i>	<i>daéva</i>

On the dual see above.

## 29.—FEMININES IN *ā*.

The *ā* is made short in the nom. sing.; but in the acc. it is preserved in *ām*; the terminations commencing with a vowel, as the instr. *a*, dat. *ái*, abl. *at*, genit. *áo*, insert *y* between these terminations and the crude forms, just as is the case in Sanskrit, e. g. *daēna-ya*, *daēna-yái*, *daēna-yáo*, &c. from *daēna*, creca, religion; in the instr. the euphonical *y* is often left out, e. g. *hizvá G.* instead of *hizvayá*, through the tongue.

The locat. is rare; it terminates in *é* as the mascul. in *a do*, e. g. *gaéthé*, in the world, from *gaéthā* Yas. 34, 2., *daéné* Yt 8, 23. in the creed. The vocative ends partially in *a*, and partially in *é*, e. g. *arvī čūra anáhité*, Ardooisoor Anaitis! (nom. *anáhita*).

PLURAL.—The nom. and acc. end in *āo*, before *cha* in *āoç* (*cha*) ; the instr. in *bīs*, *bis* ; the dat. and abl. in *byó* ; the genit. in *anām* ; the loc. in *āhu*, *āhva*. Dual forms of this class are not to be found in the texts.

Ex. : *gaētha* (a) fold, (b) world ; *gātha* song ; *daēna* (a) meditation or vision (b) creed, belief ; *urvara*, tree (Lat. *arbor*), *gena*, wife, *hizva* tongue, *zaothra* consecrated water.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>daēna</i> , <i>gaētha</i> , <i>gātha</i>	<i>daēnāo</i> , <i>gaēthāo</i> , <i>gāthāo</i>
Acc.	<i>daēnām</i> , <i>gaēthām</i> , <i>gāthām</i>	The same.
Instr.	<i>hizvā</i> G., <i>daēnaya</i>	<i>genābīs</i> G., <i>daēnābīs</i>
Dative	<i>daēnayāi</i>	<i>daēnābyó</i> , <i>gāthābyó</i>
Abl.	<i>zaothrayāt</i>	<i>gaēthābyó</i>
Gen.	<i>gaēthayāo</i>	<i>gaēthanām</i> , <i>gāthanām</i> , <i>zaothranām</i> , <i>urvaranām</i>
Loc.	<i>zaothré</i> , <i>daēné</i> , <i>gaéthé</i>	<i>gāthahva</i>
Voc.	<i>anāhité</i> , <i>maxdadhāité</i> , <i>çūra</i>	Like the nom.

### 30.—NOUNS TERMINATING IN *i* AND *u* OF ALL THE THREE GENDERS.

**SINGULAR.**—The nom. adds always *s* in nouns of masculine and feminine genders, but in certain adjectival feminine terminations *s* drops. In the acc. *i* and *u* are generally lengthened before the termination, *m*. In the instr. the termination, *a*, G. *á*, is partially added to *i* or *u* of the crude form, in which case these vowels are dissolved into their respective emivowels *y* and *w*, e. g. *vaṇhuyá*, from *vaṇhvi*, fem. good, *khrathwá*, from *khratu*, intelligence, and partially left out, in which case the instr. represents the bare crude form, e. g. *khratá*, *chicté* G., knowledge, *ṣaṣṭi*, by order, *yésti* with prayer. The dat. adds *é* in the masculine, and *ái* in the feminines terminating in *i*; the *i* of the crude form is before the termination dissolved into *ay*, which is contracted often to *é*, in which way we obtain the inflection *éé*, before *cha* generally *ayaécha*, e. g. *paitistátéé*, for withstanding, from *paitistáti*; *u* is either changed into the semivowels *v* and *w* e. g. *rathwé*, from *ratu*, chief, or it remains joined (by means of *y*) to the termination, e. g. *tanuyé* from *tanu* body. In the abl. we find the forms *óit* and *aot* (wanting in Sanskrit). In the genit. there are various forms, the mascul. take *óis*, *aos*, *éus*; the fem. *áo*, *ó*, in which case the vowel of the crude form is changed into *y* or *v*. The loc. is rare; it coincides entirely with the dat., e. g. *tanuyé* in or on the body (Vend. 4.); of the nouns in *u* we find now and then *áu* as in Sanskrit. In the voc. *i* is frequently changed into *é*, and *u* into *ó*.

**DUAL.** nom. the vowel is lengthened, e. g. *mainyú* the two spirits, from *mainyu*; the dat. is *byá* G. (*ahubyá*, to the two lives from *ahu* life); the genit. is *áo*, *u* being dissolved into *v*, e. g. *mainiváo* of the two spirits, from *mainyu*, *ahváo* of the two lives, from *ahu*, *bázváo* of the two arms, from *bázu* (S. *báhu* arm).

**Plur.** The nom. in *i* and *u* are dissolved into *ay* and *av* before the termination *é* (*ayó*, *avó*). In the acc. a contraction takes place, which has crept now and then into the nom. also; we find, besides *ayó*, *avó*, the terminations, *ís*, *ús*. The instr. is *óibis* in masc., *ibis* in fem. The dat. abl. is *byó*, *byaṣ* (*cha*). The genit. is *ām*, before which the termination *i* is to be changed into *y*, and *u* into

*v*, e. g. *yáthwām* from *yātu* witch, *kaoyām* from *kavi*, prophet, poet (used in the bad sense of a sorcerer). In order to preserve the original vowels *i* and *u*, an euphonical *n* is often inserted between them and the termination (*nām*). The locat. is *shu*, *shva*.

Ex. *açtvaiti* the fem. of *açvat*, endowed with bodies, *vaṇhus*, m., *vaṇuhi* f. *vohu* n., good; *gairi*, mountain, *mainyu*, m. spirit, *ārmaiti* f. genius of earth, *daḡyu* G. *daṇhu*, m. country, province, *nāiri*, woman, *paçu* m. cattle, *açti* f. body, existence, *barethri* mother, womb, *kshathri*, lady, *chiçti* f. knowledge.

	Singular.	Plural.
Nom.	<i>gairis</i> , <i>ratús</i> , <i>açtvaiti</i> , <i>vaṇuhi</i> , <i>vohu</i> , <i>mainyus</i>	<i>garayó</i> , <i>ratavó</i> , <i>açtayó</i> , <i>káva-</i> <i>yaçcha</i>
Acc.	<i>gairím</i> , <i>ratúm</i> , <i>açtvailím</i> , <i>vaṇuhím</i> , <i>mainyúm</i>	<i>gairís</i> , <i>ratús</i> , <i>paçús</i> , <i>açtvailís</i> , <i>vaṇhús</i> m. <i>vaṇuhís</i> , f.
Inst.	<i>ashi</i> , <i>ārmaiti</i> G., <i>khrath-</i> <i>wá</i> , <i>mainyú</i> G.	<i>azdibis</i> , G.
Dat.	<i>paitistátê</i> , <i>rathwé</i> , <i>açtvai-</i> <i>thyái</i> , <i>lanuyé</i>	<i>náiribyó</i> , <i>ratubyó</i> , <i>vaṇuhibyó</i>
Abl.	<i>barethryát</i> , <i>tanaot</i> , <i>vaṇhaot</i>	The same.
Gen.	<i>garóis</i> , <i>tanvó</i> , <i>manyēus</i> , <i>vanheus</i> , m. <i>vaṇhuyáo</i> , f. <i>açtvaiṭhyáo</i> , <i>nairyáo</i>	<i>gairinām</i> , <i>daḡyunnām</i> , <i>açtvai-</i> <i>tinām</i> , <i>yáthwām</i> , <i>vohunām</i>
Loc.	<i>tanuyé</i> , <i>anhvó</i> , <i>açtvainti</i> , <i>vaṇháu</i> , <i>gara</i> , (Af. 1, 17.)	<i>barethrishva</i> , <i>vaṇhushu</i> , <i>ksh-</i> <i>hathrishva</i>
Voc.	<i>ārmaitê</i> , <i>chiçtê</i>	

### 31.—PECULIARITIES IN THE INFLEXION OF A FEW COMMON NOUNS.

*çpan*, dog, nom. sing. *çpá*, acc. *çpánem*, instr. *çpána*, dative *çúné*, gen. *çúnó*, loc. *çpánaé(cha)*; nom. pl. *çpánó*, gen. *çúnām*.

*gáo*, animal, flesh; cow, milk; a poetical name of the earth; arm (chiefly in the dual), nom. *gáus*, acc. *gām*, instr. *gava*, dative *gavé*, abl. *gaot*; dual, nom. *gavói*, instr. *gavaéibya*; pl. nom. *gavó*, acc. *gáo*, instr. *gaobis*, gen. *gavām*.

*hware*, sun, nom. *hware*, gen. *húró*.

*máoṇh*, moon, nom. *máo*, *máoçcha* acc. *máoṇhem*, dat. *máoṇhí*, gen. *máoṇhahé*; pl. *máoṇhó*.

*çtare*, star (Latin *stella*); in composition: *çtehr-paéçañh*, starlike, sg. acc. *çtárem*, gen. *çtáró*, *çtárahé*; nom. pl. *çtáró*, acc. *çtréus*, dat. and abl. *çtarebyó*, gen. *çtárām*, *çtrām*.

*záo*, *zem*, earth, nom. sg. *záo*, acc. *zām*, instr. *zemá*, dat. *zemé*, abl. *zemát*, gen. *zemó*, loc. *zemá*, *zemé*, *zemi*; nom. and acc. pl. *zemó*, instr. *zemáis* (in compounds only), gen. *zemām*.

*nar*, man; nom. *ná*, acc. *narem*, dat. *nairé*, *naraé(cha)*, gen. *nars*, *neres* G., voc. *nare*; nom. dual, *nara*, dat. and abl. *nerebya* nom. pl. *naró*, acc. *naréus*, dat. *nerebyó*, loc. *náshú* G., *nařshú* G.

*pañtan*, way; nom. sg. *panta*,\* acc. *pañtām*, instr. *patha*, loc. *patháo*; nom. pl. *pañtánó*, acc. *pathó*, gen. *pathām*.

*açan*, day, gen. sg. *açnó*, loc. *açni*, *açné*, abl. *açndat*; gen. pl. *açnām*.

*khshapan*, night; nom. sg. *khshapa* acc. *khshapanem*, abl. *khshafndat*, gen. *khshapó* (used in the loc. also), loc. *khshafné*; uom. pl. *khshapanó* m., *khshafna* n., acc. *khshafnó*, gen. *khshafuām* (*khshapara* n., known from the Vend., is a derivation from *khshapa* meaning "night time," like as *ayara* n., from *aya*. day, means "day time)."

\* Vend. 16, 11. *panta vichinañta*, a way may be chosen (by the *Mázdəyafnas*).

## 32.—PRONOUNS.

## (A) PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

The Zend, agreeing in this part of speech, even in anomalies, with the Sanskrit, has, like the other languages of the Arian stock, a separate form for the nominative in all numbers and a separate one for the oblique cases. We find, as in other old languages, proper pronouns of the first and second persons only, but not of the third, the place of which is generally occupied by a demonstrative pronoun. In the Gâtha dialect, there are some older forms to be found. The following table exhibits the personal pronouns of the first and second persons in both dialects.

	Singular.	Dual.	Plural.
Nom.	1 <i>aem</i> , I. 2 <i>tvēm</i> , <i>tūm</i> , <i>tú</i> thou		1 <i>vaém</i> , we 2 <i>yúzhem</i> , you <i>yús</i> , G.
Acc.	1 <i>mām</i> , <i>má</i> , me 2 <i>thwām</i> , <i>thwá</i> , thee		1 <i>ahma</i> , <i>nó</i> , <i>nē</i> G.
Instr.	1 <i>má</i> ? 2 <i>thwá</i> , through thee		
Dative	1 <i>mói mé</i> , <i>maibyó</i> <i>maibyá(cha)</i> G. to me 2 <i>tói</i> , <i>té</i> , to thee		1 <i>nó</i> ; <i>nē</i> G., <i>ahmai-</i> <i>byácha</i> 2 <i>yúshmaibyá</i> , <i>vó</i> , <i>vē</i> G.
Abl.	1 <i>mat</i> , from me 2 <i>thwat</i> ; from thee		<i>yúshmat</i>
Gen.	1 <i>mana</i> , of me 2 <i>tava</i> , of thee	<i>náo</i> <i>váo</i>	<i>ahmákem</i> , <i>nó</i> ; <i>nē</i> G. <i>yúshmákem</i> , <i>vó</i> ; <i>vē</i> G.

Loc.	1 <i>mē</i> G. in me 2 <i>thwē, thwōi</i> G. in thee		
------	--	--	--

In the Gāthas we meet often the peculiar forms in *khshma*, inflected exactly like *yūzhem* (abl. *khshmat*, gen. *khshmākem*, &c.).

I explained them formerly as a secondary form for *yūzhem* conveying the same meaning "you"; but this contradicts all etymology and does not suit the passages where it is used. It is very likely a demonstrative pronoun signifying "that, such," (which is quite clear from Ys. 46,10), but used in the sense of a plural.

*hvō*=S. *sva*, himself, is often used in the Gāthas conveying the sense of an emphatic pronoun of the 3rd person sing., "he, himself."

POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS of the 1st and 2nd persons, are of two kinds, the one adding the terminations of the pronominal declension (see pag. 108) to the crude forms *ma*, *thwa*, the other taking the suffixes *ka* or *vat*. Of the former class oblique cases are only extant, as dat. *thwahmāi*, to thy, abl. *thwahmāt*, from thy, gen. sg. *mahyā* m., *magyāo* f., of my; *thwahyā* m., *thwagyāo* f., of thy; loc. sing. *mahmī*, in my, *thwahmī*, in thy, loc. pl. *thwāhū* in thy. Of the latter class are, nom. sg. *thwāvāṣ*, thine; dat. sg. *mavailē*, to mine; acc. pl. *ahmākeng*, ours, instr. pl. *ahmākāis*, through ours, dat. sg. *yūshmākāi* to your, &c. Most of these forms are peculiar to the Gāthas.

Of *hvō*, "himself," we find a possessive pronoun formed also of which I notice the dative sing. *qagyāi* f., to herself, and gen. sing. *qagyāo*, f. of herself, her own, which is also found in the Gāthas.

Of *khshma*, "those, such," the forms *khshmākai* to their, gen. sing. *khshmāvatō*, of their, loc. plu. *khshmāvogū* in their, &c. are frequently to be met with in these old songs.



### 33.—DEMONSTRATIVE, RELATIVE AND INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

All these pronouns form their cases in one and the same way ; the terminations of the cases are distinct from those of substantives and adjectives ; we style it, therefore, the pronominal declension. The dat. sing., for instance, of the masculine is *hmái*, nom. pl. *ē* gen. pl. *aēshām*, &c. as will be seen from the following list.

1 Demonstrative—*hō* m.; *hā* f.; *tat* n., this.

2 Relative—*yō* m.; *yā* f.; *yat* n., which.

3 Interrogative—*kō* m.; *kā* f.; *kat* n., who ? what ?

	Sing. m. n. 1, m. <i>hō</i> , <i>hāu</i> , <i>adā</i> 2, <i>yō</i> ; <i>yē</i> G. 3, <i>kō</i> ; <i>kē</i> G. n. <i>at</i> , <i>tat</i> ; <i>yat</i> , <i>kat</i>	Sing. fem. 1, <i>hā</i> 2, <i>yā</i> 3, <i>yat</i>	Plu. m. n. 1, m. <i>tói</i> , m. <i>tā</i> , n. 2, <i>yói</i> , m. <i>tā</i> , n. 3, <i>kói</i> , m. <i>kā</i> , n.	Pl. fem. 1, <i>táo</i> 2, <i>yáo</i> 3, <i>káo</i>
Nom.				
	1, m. <i>tem</i> , <i>tēm</i> G. 2, <i>yim</i> , <i>yēm</i> G. 3, <i>kem</i> , <i>kēm</i> G.	1, <i>tām</i> 2, <i>yām</i> 3, <i>kām</i>	1, <i>tā</i> , <i>tās</i> <i>tēng</i> G. 2, <i>yā</i> , <i>yās</i> ; <i>yēng</i> G. 3, <i>kēng</i> G.	Ditto
Acc.				
	1, m. <i>tā</i> , <i>aná</i> G., <i>ana</i> 2, <i>yā</i> 3, <i>kaénā</i> G. <i>kana</i>	1, <i>tayā</i> , <i>dyā</i> 3, <i>kayā</i>	1, m. <i>táis</i> , <i>aéibis</i> , <i>andis</i> 2, <i>yáis</i> 3, <i>káis</i>	1, <i>táis</i> ; <i>ábis</i> G.
Instr.				
	1, m. <i>ahmái</i> 2, <i>yahmái</i> 3, <i>kahmái</i>	1, <i>agyái</i> G. 3, <i>kahyái</i>	1, <i>taéibyo</i> 2, <i>yaéibyo</i> 3, <i>kaéibyo</i>	1, <i>ábyō</i> 2, <i>yábyō</i>
Dat.				

Abl.	1, m. <i>ahmát</i> 2, <i>yahmát</i> , <i>yát</i> G. 3, <i>kahmát</i>	1, <i>añhát</i> 2, <i>yénhát</i>	Ditto	Ditto
Gen.	1, m. <i>ahyá</i> G.; <i>ahé</i> 2, <i>yéhyá</i> G. <i>yénhē</i> 3, <i>kahyá</i> G.; <i>karihē</i>	1, <i>agyáo</i> , G. <i>añháo</i> 2, <i>yénháo</i> 3, <i>kariháo</i>	1, <i>aéshām</i> <sup>a</sup> 2, <i>yaéshām</i>	1, <i>anaés-</i> <i>hām, donhām</i> 2, <i>yáonhām</i>
Loc.	1, <i>ahmi</i> 2, <i>yahmi</i> 3, <i>kahmi</i>	1, <i>ahmya</i> 2, <i>yahmya</i> 3, <i>kulhra</i> where	1, <i>aéshva</i> 2, <i>yaéshu</i> <i>kulhra</i>	1, <i>áhva</i> 2, <i>yáhva</i>

Dual: nom. 1, *hí* (these two, Ys. 30, 3), *íd*; 2, *yá*.

Ditto; gen. 1, *ayáo*; 2, *yayáo*.

DEMONSTRATIVES.—Besides the demonstrative pronoun *hó* and the two others (the crude forms *a* and *ana*) which supply some cases to the former, as will be seen from the preceding table, forms of other pronominal roots are frequently in use to express the idea "this, that."

*ava*, that, nom. sg. *aom* m., *ava* f., *avat* n., acc. *aom* m., *avām* f., *avat* n.; dat. *avaqyái* f. (Yt. 10,78. refers to *dañhu* f. country) gen. *avanháo* f.; dual nom. *avá*; pl. nom. and acc. *ava*, *avé* m., *aváo* f.; instr. *aváis*, abl. *avalbyó*, gen. *avaéshām*.

*i*, *ima* this, sing. nom. *aém* m., *ím* f., *imat* n.; acc. *imām* f.; pl. nom. *imáo* f., *imá* n. G., acc. *imām*; *imáo* f.

*aésha* this, sg. nom. *aéshó* m., *aésha* f., *aétat* n.; *aétem* m., *aétlām* f.; instr. *aéta* m., *aétaya* f.; dat. *aétahmái* m., *aétahmát* n., *aétariháo* f.; gen. *aétahé* m., *aétariháo*, *aétayáo* f.; loc. *aétahmi* m.; pl. nom. *aété* m., *aétaó* f.; acc. *aéta*, m. n., *aétaó* f.; gen. *aétaéshām* m., *aétarihām* f.; loc. *aétaéshva* m. dual gen. *aétayáo*.

Besides these demonstratives, here enumerated, we meet (chiefly in the Gâthas) with several oblique cases of other pronominal roots, which are used rather as enclitics, being appended to other stronger words, than as full independent words; one may style them "accentless pronouns." Of the root *da* we find the acc. sg. *dim* after particles as *á* (to), *paiti* (again), *nóit* (not), in the meaning of "him;" its neuter is *dít* it (Afr. 1,4); acc. pl. *dis*, them.

*í*, *ím*, *ít\** are in the Gâthas often added to other words, chiefly to the relative pronoun *ya*, or the negative particle *nóit*, not, in order to make it more emphatical. In most cases it has no meaning which may be expressed by words in the modern languages; now and then it conveys the sense of an oblique case of a pronoun e. g. *ím* Ys. 46,5 "him;" *ís* acc. pl. "them."

Of the root *si*, *hi*, we find *hé*, *hói* (*sé* only after vowels e. g. *yézi sé*) in the sense of a genitive: of it, of him, and *hím* as an acc. sg. "him."

INTERROGATIVES.—Besides the root *ha* we find the secondary form *cha*, *chi*, applied in putting direct and indirect questions; but it is more frequently used in combination with another word in order to generalise its sense, as we shall see (pg. 111). Nom. sg. m. f. *chis* who? *chít* n. what, acc. *chím*, dat. *chahmái*, abl. *chóit*, gen. *chahya*. In the oblique cases it means, "one, any one," (compare the Latin *quis* who? used instead of *aliquis* any one). *Chvat*, how much? pl. *chvañtó* how many?

### 34.—OTHER PRONOMINAL FORMS.

#### CORRELATIVE PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES MEANING ONE OUT OF TWO.

These are formed out of the crude forms of the demonstrative, relative and interrogative pronouns by means of the comparative termination *tara*, viz. *atara* either, *yatára* whether, *katára*, whether G. The neutral form *katárem* introduces now and then, like the Latin *utrum* a question referring to the

\* These little words are to be found in the same meaning in the Vedic language also, but not in the classical Sanskrit.

preference of one thing to another, e. g. Ys. 31,17.: *kaldrem ashavá vá dregváó vá verenvaile máxyó?* whether, the pious or the wicked teaches the greater (thing)?

#### CORRELATIVES EXPRESSING "KIND, MANNER."

*avat*, such, nom. sg. *aváo* m., *avaiti* f., *avat* n.; acc. *avdoñtem*, *avavat* nom. sg., *avavaiti* f. this much, such; instr. *avavata* gen. *avavató*; gen. *avavatām*.

*tátáo* f. Yt. 5,15, acc. pl. "such,"—*yavan*, *yavat*, for how long a time, see Yt. 15,40.: *yat nmánó-paitim viñláma yavánem* (acc. sing. m.) *çraēsta kehpa yó nó huberetām barot yavata* (instr. sing. m.) *gaya júva*, that we may have the house father go long (living) in the best health, to bestow boons upon us during how long a time we both (the father on the one side, the children on the other) may live.

#### INDEFINITE PRONOUNS.

These are formed, as mentioned above, by the addition of *cha*, *chis* or *chit* to another pronoun or an adverb, e. g. *kaçchit*, any one, every one (declined like *kó*, who? e. g. dat. *kahmáichit* to every one); *chischa* whosoever; *uaēchis* none, *máchis*, no body (the latter is chiefly used, in prohibitive sentences).

*chit* can be added to nouns, substantives and adjectives also, in order to generalise the meaning, and may often be best translated by "whatever," e. g. *duēvachit* whatever devils. Exactly in the same sense *china* (S. *chana*) is now and then added to a word.

#### PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES.

These, as for instance, *viçpa* all, *anya* another, follow partially the peculiarities of the pronominal declension; nom. pl. *viçpé*, *anyé*, gen. pl. *viçpaéshām*, *anyaéshām*.

### 35.—NUMERALS.

1. *aśva* (nom. and in composition *aśvó*); 2 *dva*, *va*, *duyé*, *uyé* and *bi*, if forming part of a compound; \* 3 *thri* (nom. *thráyó*);

\* Instead of these different forms of *dva*, the dual nom. *uðé* (Lat. *ambo*, S. *ubhé*), instr. and dat *uðóibyd*, gen. *uðóyó* "both" is used, chiefly in the Gáthe dialect.

4 *chathware*, *chathru* in compounds (nom. *chathwáro*) ; 6 *pañcha*, *meñda* G. ; 6 *khshvas*, *khshvidem* G. ; 7 *hapta* ; 8 *asta* ; 9 *nava* ; 10 *daça* ; 11 *aévañdaça* ; 12 *dvadaça*, 13 *thrídaça* ; 14 *chathrudaça* ; 15 *pañchadaça* ; 16 *khshvasdaça* ; 17 *haptadaça* ; 18 *astadaça* ; 19 *navadaça* ; 20 *viçaiti* ; 30 *thriçāṣ* (*cha*), *thriçatem*, ; 40 *chathwareçatem* ; 50 *pañcháçat*, *pañcháçatem* ; 60 *khshvasti* ; 70 *haptáthi* ; 80 *astaiti* ; 90 *navaiti* ; 100 *çatem* (dat. sg. *çatéē* ; in composition *çata* and *çató*), 200 *duyē çaitē*, 400 *cbathware çata* ; 500 *pancha çata* etc ; 1000 *hazanra* ; 10,000 *baévere* ; 100,000 *ahākhsta*.

The ordinals are : *paoirya*, *frakhstya* first ; *bitya* second ; *thritya* third ; *khtáirya*, *táirya*\* fourth ; *pukhlha* fifth ; *khstva*, sixth ; *haptatha* seventh ; *astema* eighth ; *náuma* ninth ; *daçema* tenth ; *aévañdaça* (nom. *aévañdaçó*) eleventh ; *navadaça* (*có*) nineteenth.

Multiplication numerals are formed by addition of *keret* and *rat* (nom. mas. sg. *váo*) *hakeret* once, *bis*, *biçhvat* twice, *thris*, *thriçhvat* thrice ; *viçaitiváo* 20 fold, *thriçathwáo* 30 fold, *chathwareçathwáo* 40 fold, *haptaitiváo* 70 fold ; *çatáyus* hundred fold ; *hazanráis* thousand fold ; *baévaróis* ten thousand fold.

### 35.—PARTICLES.

A complete enumeration and exact description of the particles belonging more properly to the dictionary than to the grammar, I shall confine myself to making some remarks only.

ADVERBS : *athra* there, *idha*, *idá* G. here, *ta-íha* there ; *yathra* where, *kuthra*, *kutha* where ? *avathra* there ; *yatha* as, like as, *kutha* how ? *inja* here, *tinja* there, *upairi* above, *adhairi* below, down, *úti* so, thus. *nú*, *nu*, now ; *yava* ever (Yt. 22,10), *yavat* how long ; *yadhóit* whence ; *bá* certainly ; *moshu* soon ; *bádha* quickly, surely, *bádhistem* soonest ; *frakhsni* in direction of,

\* The nom. sg. m. of all these ordinals in *ya* ends in *yó*, the acc. in *im*, e. g. *paoirim* *bítim* etc.

towards; *aisiūt* round about, *para* before, *paçcha* afterwards, *paitis* in presence (*pesh* in modern Pers.) etc.—There are several negatives: *nōit* not (from *na it*), *mā* not (prohibitive); *naēdha*, *nava*, *navāt* (instead of *na-vā*; *na-vā-at*) neither, nor.

PREPOSITIONS.—We find the same as in the Sanscrit; they are, as to their position, used very freely; if forming a part of the verb, they may be separated from it, as is the case in the Vedic and Homeric languages (not in the usual Sanscrit and Greek); often they are put twice, once without the verb and then with the verb; they can be placed before and after the noun; if the noun is qualified by an adjective or participle, the preposition is generally put between them. They govern, if put to a noun, different cases, some take the accusative as *upa* in, at, *avi* to, towards; some the instrumental as *mat* with; some the dative as *paiṛi* round, against; some the ablative as *paiti* in, at, during; some the locative as *aibi* in, about, *paiti* in, upon, at, etc.; but most of them can govern several cases, as is the case in Latin and Greek also.

Two prepositions deserve a peculiar attention, *ā* and *hacha*. *ā* S. *ā*, means to, towards, and governs in this meaning the accusative; but together with *hacha* it is applied to express the idea “from—to,” in which case both govern the ablative; *ā* serves in this case, expressing “to, up to” and *hacha* “from” e. g. *hacha gayāt marathnāt āçaošhyañtāt verethraghnāt* Yt. 13,145. from Gayomart (the first man, Adam) to Sosiosh Verethraghna (the prophet and redeemer, expected by the Parsees at the end of the word); *hachā hō-vakhshāt ā hū-frāshmō-dātōit* Yt. 5,91 from sunrise to sunset. *Hacha* governs the ablat. and instrum. in the meaning ‘from’: *apākhtarāt hacha umānāt* from the northern country; *hacha ushastara Heñdva avi daoshastarem* from the eastern India to the western. If added to the accusative, it means “for, in favour.”

CONJUNCTIONS *cha* (always affixed to another word) and, also, *uta* and, also; *at* so, *atha*, then, thus; *yēzi*, *yēidhi* if; *zi* then, therefore; *viçpem ā ahmāt* for the purpose, in order to, that; *vā* or; *vā-vā* either—or, etc.

### 36.—THE TWO DIALECTS OF THE ZEND LANGUAGE.

After having pointed out in the preceding paragraphs of the outlines of a Zend grammar, in each particular case, the differences of the Gâtha language from the common Zend, I shall now briefly state my views on the relationship in which they stand to each other. The chief question arising here is, whether they represent the same language in two different periods of age, or two contemporary dialects, spoken in two different regions of the territories of the ancient Bactrian empire. Our knowledge of the dialects of the Iranian tongues and the periods of their development at the time previous to the Christian era is so limited, that it is extremely difficult to decide this question in a satisfactory way.

The differences between these two dialects are both of a phonetical and grammatical nature. Were the deviations merely of the former kind, we should be fully entitled to ascribe them to two different ways of pronouncing certain vowels and consonants, as generally happens in different districts with nations speaking the same language; but should we discover in one of them more full and ancient forms, in the other evidently younger and more contracted ones, then the difference between the Gâtha language and the usual Zend is to be ascribed to different periods of age.

The phonetical differences of the Gâtha language from that of the other books are at the first glance so considerable as to induce one to trace them to different localities of the same country, and not to different ages. But on a closer inquiry (see pag. 54.) we find that several of these phonetical peculiarities, as the constant lengthening of vowels at the end, the severing of one syllable into two, as for instances, of *yâ* (nom. pl. neutr. relat. pronoun), into *ēā* are attributable to the original singing of the Gâthas, and the other smaller pieces constituting the older *Yasna* (see the 3rd Essay), and are not to be traced to dialectical

differences. Only the change of one vowel into another, such as that of final *ó*, or initial *a*, into *e*, e. g. *ké* = *kó* who? *émavat* strong, instead of *amavat*, and some consonantal changes, as *t* into *ç*, e. g. *çtavaç* praising, instead of *çtavat*, or the softening of harsh consonants as *adrēng* (acc. pl. of *atar* fire), instead of *áthráç*, etc. are suggestive of dialectical differences. But these deviations being of no great importance, no great weight can be attached to them. These deviations are merely of such a nature as might exist between the idioms even of neighbouring villages or towns of the same district. That these peculiarities, notwithstanding their insignificance, have been preserved so well, and not been dissolved and changed into the current Bactrian language, which is preserved in the largest portion of the Zend-Avesta, indicate the high reverence in which those songs stood in the eyes of the Zoroastrians. In consideration, that (besides other reasons) the Gâthas contain the undoubted teaching of Zarathustra himself, we do not hesitate to believe this peculiar language used in the Gâthas to have been the dialect of his town or village.

As to grammatical forms, the Gâtha dialect shows not a few deviations from the current Zend language. Most of them represent evidently a more primitive state of the Bactrian language, nearer to its Arian source; some might be considered as merely dialectical peculiarities. The genit. sg. of the mascul. in *a* (see pag. 99) ends nearly throughout in the Gâthas in *ahyá*, whilst in the common Zend language there is always *ahé*, apparently a contraction of *ahya* which exactly corresponds with the Sanscrit genitive termination *asya* (e. g. *daévahyá*, Z. *daévaké*, S. *devasya*); the first pers. imperat. expressing intention, volition (see pag. 69), requires only *á*, *ái*, whereas in the common Zend language the derived termination *ái* which is used in Sanscrit also, prevails; the usual infinitive formation in the Gâthas is that in *dyái* which is so extremely frequent in the Vedic dialect, while it is nearly unknown to the common Zend, and totally to the classical Sanscrit. In the pronouns chiefly, the language of the



songs shows more ancient forms, than we find in any other part of the Zend Avesta, e. g. *maibyá* "to me" which original form, agreeing so well with the Sanscrit *mahyam*, Lat. *mihi* (to me), is nowhere to be found in the common Zend; *mahyá* m., compare further *magyáo* f. of me, etc. (see pag. 107). The frequent use of the enclitic pronominal particles *i*, *im*, *him*, etc. (see pag. 110), which is a peculiar feature of the Vedic dialect, distinguishing it from the classical Sanscrit, and the great liberty of separating the preposition from its verb, a chief characteristic of the most ancient forms of the Sanscrit (in the Vedas), and the Grecian languages (in Homer), indicate a more ancient stage of language in the Gátha dialect, than we can discover in the common Zend, where these traces of a more floating and not quite settled form of expression are much fewer, and only in poetical pieces occasionally to be met with.

According to these remarks, there seems to be no doubt, that the dialect of the Gáthas shows some traces of a higher antiquity than we can claim for the classical Zend. But the differences are not so great as between the Vedic and the classical Sanscrit, and the Greek of Homer and that of the Attic dialect; the two dialects of the Zend-Avesta being much closer to each other. They represent one and the same language with such changes as might be brought about within the space of one or two centuries. The Gátha dialect is therefore only 100 or, at the utmost, 200 years older than the classical Zend which was the standard language of the ancient Iranian empire as depicted in the earlier parts of the Shâhnâmeh.

### 37.—ZEND IN ITS AFFINITY TO SANSKRIT.

Every one who is but slightly acquainted with Sanscrit and Persian will, after the perusal of this sketch of the Zend grammar, be wholly convinced of the close affinity, in which the Zend language stands to both. Its relation to the most ancient Sanscrit,

the so-called Vedic dialect,\* is as close, as that of the different dialects of the Grecian language (Aeolic, Ionic, Doric, Attic) to each other. The language of the sacred songs of the Brahmins, and that of the Parsees are nothing but two dialects of two or more tribes of one and the same nation. As the Ionians, Dorians, Aetolians, etc. are different tribes of the Grecian nation, whose general name was "Hellenes," the ancient Brahmins and Parsees are only two tribes of the nation which is called *Aryas* both in Veda and Zend Avesta, the former to be compared with the Ionians, the latter with the Dorians. The most striking feature perceptible in comparing both Zend dialects with Sanskrit is, that they are related to the Vedic form of Sanskrit only, not to the classical. In verbal forms, chiefly moods, and tenses, the classical Sanskrit, though very rich in comparison with modern language, is much poorer than its more primitive form preserved in the Vedas only, having lost, for instance, various forms of the subjunctive mood, most tenses of all other moods, except Indicative (in the Imperative and Potential moods only the present tense is preserved), the manifold forms expressing the infinitive mood,† etc. whereas all these formations in the greatest completeness are to be met with in the Vedas, Zend Avesta, and the Homeric Greek. The syntactical structure is in the Vedic Sanskrit and the Zend simple enough, and verbal forms are much more frequently made use of than in the classical Sanskrit. There is no doubt, the classical Sanskrit was formed long after the separation of the Iranians from the Hindus.

\* It is distinct from the usual Sanskrit which alone is studied by the Brahmins now-a-days. The most learned Pandits of the present Brahminic community who are perfectly acquainted with the classical Sanskrit language, are utterly unable to explain the more ancient portions of the Vedas, which consist chiefly of songs, and speculations on the meaning of rites, their effects, etc. They learn them parrot-like by heart, but do not care a bit about understanding their prayers. If they are requested to tell the meaning, they resort to a commentary made several hundred years ago by a highly celebrated Brahmin (Śāyana), but which on a closer enquiry proves to be entirely insufficient (it is made without critical judgment, and without reference to parallels), to arrive at a complete insight into the Vedic antiquity.

† In the Vedic language there are eleven to be observed which are reduced in the classical Sanskrit to one only.

The differences between the Vedic Sanscrit and the Zend languages are very little in grammar, but are chiefly of a phonetical and lexicographical nature, as the difference is between German and Dutch. There are certain regular changes of sounds, and other phonetical peculiarities perceptible, the knowledge of which enables the philologist to make the Zend word easily a pure Sanscrit one. The most remarkable changes are as follows :—

initial *s* in Sanscrit is in the Zend changed into *h*; ex. : *soma* (the sacred drink of the Brahmans) = *homa* ; *sama* together, the same = *hama* ; *sa* demonstrat. " he" = *ha* ; *sach* to follow (Latin *sequi*) = *hach*. In the word itself the same change takes place, e. g. *aṇhu* = S. *asu* life, except now and then in the last syllable, where *s* is preserved e. g. *yazaê-sa* thou shalt worship. At the end it remains, except if preceded by *a* in which case both (*as*) are changed into *ô* ; only before the enclitic particle *cha* the sibilant is kept, e. g. *ahurô*, (S. *asura-s*) living, instead of *ahura-s*, but *ahuraçcha* (and the living).

*h* of Sanscrit where it is no original, but only a derived sound, never remains in Zend. It is generally changed into *z*, e. g. *zi* " then, therefore" = S. *hi*, *zima* winter = S. *hima*, *zbe* (root) to invoke = S. *hvé*. *z* is further equivalent to S. *j*, e. g. *zan* (mod. Pers. *zâdan*) to produce = S. *jan* (Lat. *gigno*), *hizva* tongue = *jihvâ*. On the peculiar sound *q* which corresponds with S. *sv* see pag. 55.

In comparing Zend with Sanscrit words, we observe often a nasal sound in the former which is wanting in the latter. This is chiefly the case before *h*, e. g. *aṇhu* = *asu*.

Instead of Sanscrit *çv* we meet in Zend with *çp* e. g. *açpa* a horse = S. *açva* (Late. *equus*, Greek *hippos*), *vîçpa* all = S. *vîçva*, *çpâ* a dog = S. *çvâ*.

In the place of the Sanscrit *ṛt* we find, besides the regular change *aret* (the vowel *ṛ* in Sanscrit is in Zend always represented by *are*, *cre* ; *ṛt* itself is a corruption of *art*) that in *ash* e. g. *mashya* man = S. *martya* (Lat. *mortalis*, Greek *brotos*), *asha* true, sincere = S. *ṛta*.

These are the most remarkable phonetical differences existing between Sanscrit and Zend. By means of them it is very simple to find the corresponding word in Sanscrit, and in strictly adhering to them we can discover a large number of Vedic words and forms. There are, of course, now and then (as is always the case in the dialects of every language) peculiar words to be found in Zend, but always traceable to Sanscrit roots

A comparison of the grammatical forms of Zend and Sanscrit can be dispensed with here. They are so very near, and in many cases entirely identical, that they suggest themselves by itself to any one who has but a slight acquaintance with Sanscrit. The strongest proof for the original identity of Sanscrit and Zend forms, as regards grammar, is the harmony of both even in irregularities. So, for instance, the deviations of the pronominal declensions from that of the nouns, are in both languages the same, e. g. Z. *ahmái* to him = S. *asmái*, *kahmái* to whom = S. *kasmai*, *yaéehām* of whom (pls) = S. *yeshām*. The declension of irregular nouns as Z. *çpan* a dog = S. *çvan* Z. *pantan* way = S. *pathin* (path) is the same : nom. sg. Z. *çpá* = S. *çvá* ; acc. *çpánem* = *çváuam* ; dat. *çú:re* = *çúnām* gen. *çúnó* = *çunas* nom. pl. *çpánó* = *çvánás*, gen. *çúnām* = *çunám* ; nom. sg. *pañta* = *panthás* ; instr. *patha* = *pathá* ; nom. pl. *pañtánó* = *panthánas* ; acc. *pathó* = *pathas* ; gen. *pathām* = *pathám*.

The extremely close affinity of Zend to the Vedic Sanscrit is chiefly to be seen from some present tense forms which differ in the classical Sanscrit from the Vedic ; compare, for instance, Z. *herenaomi*, I make, with the Vedic ; *kṛnomi* and the S. *karomi* ; Z. *jamaiti* (instead of *gamaiti*), Ved. *gamati*, S. *gacchati* he goes ; Z. *gereionámi*, Ved. *grbhñámi*, S. *gr hn mi* I take.



## VOWELS.

а, á, ä; и, í; у, ú; е, é, ɛ; ɔ, ó; ai, ái; au, áu; ao, áo; ɛu.

a, Gutturals: و *k*, ک *kh*, ق *q*; گ *g*, گھ *gh*; ه *h*.

b, Palatals :  $\gamma$  *ch*;  $\gamma$  *j*.

c, Dentals: *t*, *ṭ* (at the end of words) *t*, *ṭh*; *d*, *ḍh*.

d, Labials:  $p$ ,  $f$ ,  $b$ .

e, Semivowels : **د** *y*, **ر** *r*, **و** *v*, **ک** *w*.

f, Sibilants : **س** *s*, (ss), **ش** *sh*, **ص** *s* ; **ز** *z*, **ذ** *zh*.

g, Nasals :  $\text{c}$  m,  $\text{}$  n,  $\text{}$  ñ,  $\text{}$  ñ,  $\text{}$  ñ.

SPECIMEN OF READING.

(The *Yathá Ahu vairyo* prayer)

To be read from right to left.

t i h c t á s h a s u t a r á h t a ó y r i a v á h a á h t a y

ထိုသို့သောအခါများတွင် အသုံးပြုသည့် နည်းလမ်းများမှာ အောက်ပါအတိုင်း ဖြစ်ပါသည်။

 $\hat{a} \hbar c \approx \hbar$ 

*m ā n a n t h o a y k s ó h n a n a m á d z a d s u é h n a v*

ॐ नमो भगवते वासुदेवाय ॥

i d d z a m s u e h n a

بۇ بۇگەرد مىيادى رۇھادى خەرىتىسى كۆرسىتىدۇ

by bu ger d mi y á i á r u h a á ch m e r h t a h s k h

وہو سہجہ. واسد سہجہ (۱) سہجہ

merátçá v tãdãd



